SOME

REFLECTIONS

UPON THE

Short Consideration

Of the DEFENCE of the

EXCEPTIONS

AGAINST THE

Theory of the Earth.

Dur 608

By *E. W. M. A.*

לא יראתם לדבר בעבדי במשה

Numb. 12. 8.

Licens'd *February* 22d, 1691.

LONDON

Printed; And are to be Sold by *J. Southby*, at the *Harrow* in *Cornhil.* 1692.

REFLECTIONS

UPON THE

On the DEFENCE of the

EXCEPTIONS

AGAINST THE

Theory of the Earth.

BY T. W. M. A.

1692
tW288

LONDON

To my Reverend Friend T. W. D. D.

SIR,

FOR your Letter relating to the Subject of this Paper, I could not but here return you Thanks. Those learned Friends of yours and mine, to whom it was communicated, unanimously agree as to the truth of that Character, which you give the Gentleman with whom I am concerned.

Particularly they approve of that home Similitude, where you say he's as much afraid of an Argument, as he is of a Bear; and will venture as soon to take the one by the Tooth, as fairly to encounter the other. For as you rightly observe, when an Argument comes towards him, he cares

not for meeting it. But in his ſhifting, trifling, and deſultory manner, will evade it if poſſible or retreat from it. And tho when he's wheeled, about, and gotten behind it, he can pluck up ſo much courage as to give it a piece of a blow; yet then he'll be ſure to run away when he has done, for fear it ſhould turn again and bite him. The Inſtances you alledge of his declining or ſuperficially anſwering the Arguments, which prove an *open Sea*, and *Metals* before the Flood, *&c.* juſtify your Compariſon.

They are pleaſed likewiſe with your other Simile, where you reſemble his Anſwers to a wild kind of Dance, which he has led up in very odd ſteps: as if he meant to ſhew people how he could friſk it in his own conceit, and entertain them with variety of Scholaſtick Anticks.

They conclude you are juſt alſo, in thinking he is no longer to be *over-ſeriouſly*, dealt with. And ſo far has your Advice prevailed here, that I have taken the liberty (where he gives occaſion) to recreate my Pen with ſome *lighter* remarks. For to be ty'd all to ſeriouſneſs in purſuing his Fripperies, would be inſufferable pennance.

You

You merrily note, that he adviſeth the Excepter, of *all trades* not to turn *Hypotheſis-maker*. And truly I reſolve to take his Advice upon the account of his Example. Which is more than a little diſcouraging.

His Reflections, you obſerve, are *dull*, where he loads the Excepter with *Rudeneſs*, *Injudiciouſneſs*, *Ignorance*, *Clownery*, *&c.* But as you well ſuggeſt, I need not take that ill of him, conſidering his *Character* of the *Sacred Writers*. Tho the Truth is, the expreſſions are not only *heavy*, but *unlucky* things. For as they fall down right with a dead weight, as we muſt imagine the Fragments of his broken Earth did into his Abyſs: ſo they diſcover the ſame effects. That is, they plainly ſhew a *Diſſolution* of temper, and a *Deluge* of paſſions. Which bieng cauſelelly wrought up into violent agitations, and unhandſom commotions; I do only wiſh happily retir'd again into ſweet compoſure, and into ſuch a quiet and orderly ſettlement as may be eaſy to himſelf.

A Friend of mine plainly ſuggeſted (*Reply p.* 200, 201.) that the Theoriſt was made acquainted with my *Exceptions* while they were in *writing*; and printed the firſt part of his *Latin* Theo-

ry

ry a *second* time, to *leave out* Paſſages, in that Edition, againſt which *unanſwerable* Objections were made. Now *you* think, that to the *truth* of this ſuggeſtion, the Conſiderer, by his *ſilence* does give *conſent*. And to this *thought* of yours, I ſay no more at preſent, but that it is not yours alone, and poſſibly you are not deceived in it. But if you will hold in the mind you are of, that leaving paſſages out of Books, amongſt writing Diſputants, is the ſame with mens *running away* in other ingagements, to ſave themſelves; and ſo conclude, as you do, that ſome body has fairly here ſhown a pair of heels: I cannot help it.

Conſidering his *Matter*, you blame him for his *Stile*; and complain the one is too ſharp, unleſs the other was more ſolid. But here I muſt leave *you* (as well as other Readers) to your own Judgment.

Sir, I cite no more Paſſages out of your Letter, tho I have leave to mention as many as I think fit. And if for what I have noted, you be marked e're long for a *Ruſtical Wit*, or be ſent to bear poor *Demea* company: yet you having given me the liberty that you did, you can by no means find fault with him that took it.

As

As I told you in my last, these Reflections were my Harvest thoughts; and were sown, as I may say, while we were reaping the benefits of *Ceres*. The reasons why they sprung up in public no sooner, are known to many, and I believe to you; and therefore you shall not be troubled with them here, by

Yours, &c.

Some

The Bookseller to the Reader.

THe Preſs which ſhould have printed theſe Reflections ſooner being ingaged in another work, was the occaſion of their coming out ſo late.

ERRATA.

IN the firſt Page Line 14. after *march'd* inſert *him.* f. *this* r. *his.* p. 3: l. 17. r. *Conſideration.* p. 9. l. 18. after *out* inſ. *that.* l. 29. f. *but* r. *out.* p. 13. l. 9. after *he* inſ. *thinks.* p. 14. l. 19. after *does* inſ. *it.* p. 30. l. 11. before *he* inſ. *as.* l. 12. dele *as.* p. 33. l. 21. after *be* del. *ſo.* l. 33. after *be* inſ. *the* l. 34. r. *Dool-ſtones.* p. 35. l. 15. r. *hundreds.* p. 36. l. 17. r. *beſides.* p. 38. l. 22. after *well* inſ. *or.* p. 42. l. 21. r. *deſtruſion* p. 44: l. 4. after *mountains* add *covered.*

SOME REFLECTIONS UPON THE SHORT CONSIDERATION, &c.

THe *Conſideration* conſiſts of one and twenty Leaves. And nine of them are taken up in gueſſing *what it was in the late Anſwer, that ſo much diſcompoſes the Excepter, &c.* p. 2. Surprizingly ſuitable and uſeful Method! The Anſwerer was lately charg'd, in our Reply, with good plenty of *Miſtakes*, *Untruths*, and *Contradictions*; ſuch as mean Writers would be much aſham'd of. And now Philoſopher-like, he here turns *Conſiderer*, and ſpends half a Book in *gueſſing* at what might *diſturb* the Replicant. As if a man ſet in Stocks for his Miſdemeanours, inſtead of clearing himſelf of the crimes, in order to his freedom, ſhould buſie his Head in counting what Straws the Officer trod on, when he march'd along to this honourable Confinement.

And then are not thoſe *Eighteen* pages in *Folio*, ſpent to very good purpoſe too? For as they that go by *gueſs* are commonly out; ſo is the *Conſiderer* in this his Conjecture: even as much out as he is in his Theory. For ſo far was the Excepter from being at all *diſcompos'd* by what was in that Anſwer, that he's not yet diſorder'd by the contents of the Letter. The *Conſiderer*, if he pleaſes, may ſuffer his tranſports, and be his own tormentor. But in caſe he intended diſquiet to the Excepter, that Deſign is fruſtrated utterly by himſelf. For he has ſo fitted the thing which ſhould have been the Inſtrument of his perturbation, that 'tis become an occaſion of his ſpecial Diverſion. And as when

he first perused this large Epistle, it tickled his Spleen with *trifling Extravagancies*; so the Considerer must pardon him, if he writes *now*, as he read *then*; making the exercise his *Sport*, rather than his *Work*. And in Testimony of a calm and undisturbed mind, he will little regard the flashy picqueerings of his angry Pen; but will leave him that wrote them, to reap both the benefit and glory of them.

Nor need any wonder he should be so brimful, as to boil over at the rate he here does: For they say Confutation has a cruel Sting, and where it strikes the Erroneous and sticks in their sides, the smart it causes is apt to heat extremely. But if the Gentleman grows feverish upon this account, we
Answ. p. 11. can lend him a convenient Cooler of his own: namely, *Weak Reasons, commonly produce strong Passions.*

But never let him trouble himself with this groundless Phantcy; as if those *Passages* he has gathered out of his Answer, were
Answ. p. 4. *exasperating* to us. They are none of them so poinant as to be provoking. I mean *offensively* or to any *uneasiness*. Tho to see Arguments and Answers that should have been manag'd and maintain'd, run out in such *Passages*, to prove the Excepter railed, must needs be provoking, and highly provoking another way. Even enough to make gravity forget it self a while; and to force an *Heraclitus* to throw down his Handkerchief, and hold his sides. But let us to our sport.

In the first place he blames the Author of the Defence for
Answ. p. 1. his *Judgment and temper*. But to speak freely, where shall we find *less* of *both*, than in his *own* Writings? And he that is notoriously guilty of the faults he corrects; while he reproves another, does but reproach himself. The man that finds fault with a Wart on my Face, should by no means have a Bunch on his own Back. But *id mantricæ non vitemus.*

Next he accuses us of being *too verbose and long-winded*. And so all cry out that wind is too long, tho never so short, that blasts their fine Flowers, or blows down their Houses.

Our

Our Author it seems is of *his* mind, who being to die, desir'd he might be killed with a *short* Sword. Yet upon *consideration*, one may easily *guess*, that 'tis neither number of words, nor length of Reply, but something else in them both, that frets the Complainant. And then he slily condemns *us* of *prolixity* here, to palliate his *own* most *culpable Brevity*; the Answers he sends out, being apparently *short* in more senses than one.

Then he reports a new Discovery he has made; I mean, in our Divinity. And the same discovers his own Judgment as notably. *It seems according to his Theology, all errors in Religion are Blasphemy, for all errors in Religion are against Scripture.* Now tho it is impossible they should *seem* so to *others*, for the Reason he has hit upon; yet 'tis like enough they may *seem* so to him. But then this evidently shews how ill a thing it is, for a man to be guilty of long Theory and *short Considerations*; when they cannot clear his mind from such clouds of *Seemingness*. *Ib. p. 3.*

'Twas this Mist of *Seemingness* that dimm'd his eye-sight, when he lookt at the *first* of the *passages* mentioned; and made him think he there saw a *Blunder* of *ours*, when indeed it was one of his *own* making. The Moon, said the Excepter, would have hindred the formation of the Earth. *That* it could not do, said the Answerer; for the Moon was made the fourth day, and the Earth the third. But, said the Replicant, that Earth we dispute against, is the Theorists, *which could not be formed the third day* (as being *increased* daily) *and therefore had the Moon been made the fifth, or sixth day, or after; it might have been made time enough to hinder the formation of* this *Earth.* Now pray what says our Author here at last? Why, *either he* (the Replicant) *speaks upon* Moses's *Hypothesis, or upon the* Theorists. Well *guess* again. 'Tis a sign he had put his *considering* cap on, else he could never have hit so right. He proceeds; *if he speaks upon Moses's Hypothesis, the Moon made the fourth day, must have hindred the formation of the Earth, the third. If upon* *Ib. p. 4.* *Rep. p. 12, 13* *Cons. p. 5.*

the Theoriſt's, *the* Theoriſt *does not ſuppoſe the Moon preſent then.* And thus it appears *whoſe* the *Blunder* is, and *where* it lies, in the Conſiderer's Error. For did we ſpeak upon *either* of the Hypotheſes *ſingly*? So far were we from that, that we plainly *oppoſed* one to the other, that ſo by one we might *overthrow* the other. And muſt not the true one ſubvert the falſe one? And muſt not that be true, which Scripture tells us is ſo? And does not Scripture tell us the Moon was made the fourth day (as ſurely as the Sun was) and that the Earth was formed the third? And does not
Anſw. p. 5. the Anſwerer himſelf ſay, it *tells us* ſo, where, in this caſe, he fairly appeals to Scripture as a Judge? Why, then as 'tis *impoſſible* that the Moon which was made the fourth day, ſhould hinder the formation of *Moſes*'s Earth, which was form'd *before* that day; ſo it is as *probable*, if not *neceſſary*, that it muſt hinder the formation of the Theoriſt's Earth (conſidering the method of its formation) it being to be formed *after* that day. And conſequently this ſubtil Anſwer of his, ſinks into a blunder, by his miſtaking the way of procedure in the matter. But where we ſaid, the Theoriſt's Earth could not be formed the third day, what means he to tell us, we *ſhould have Added, and therefore* would be hinder'd by the Moon (*Conſ. p. 5.*) when we did add theſe words; *therefore had the Moon been made, the fifth or ſixth day, or after, it might have been made time enough to hinder the formation of this Earth*? The Doctors eyes were ſo dull'd with *Seemingneſs* here, that 'tis plain he could not ſee the Wood for Trees. To be reveng'd on the Excepter, does he intend to Philoſophize his Senſes away?

He farther ſuggeſts, that they who underſtand *Moſes's ſix days Creation literally*, muſt hold to it. And ſo the Excepter has done. For in aſſerting that the Moon, made the fourth day, hindred the formation of the Earth; he did not contradict *Moſes*'s Hypotheſis, but the Hypotheſis againſt which the Objection was directed. And this the Conſiderer muſt needs have ſeen, had not his eyes been dazled with *Seemingneſs* ſtill. The

The Second paſſage is about the *Origin of Mountains.* Where he likes not our dividing them into *Maritime* and *Inland* ones. And why? Ib.

Firſt, becauſe *Scripture makes no ſuch Diſtinction of them.* And how ſhould it, when in the ſtory of the Creation, it does not ſo much as *name* them? Tho this is no Argument neither that they were not then made: for Scripture does not mention the Creation of *Angels*, and yet we are ſure they exiſted from the firſt. Beſides, Things that are ſpoken of in *Moſes's* Coſmopœia, are *not diſtinguiſht* by Scripture, tho moſt *different* in *themſelves.* How very *different* from one another, are the *Sun* and *Moon*? Yet Scripture calls them *two great Lights*; making no diſtinction at all betwixt them, as to the Nature or Quality of the light that is in them, or beams from them, tho in the one it be *native*, and in the other but *borrowed.* P. 6. Gen.

And whereas he puts the caſe, *if he will not confine their production to* Moſes's *ſix days, how will he keep to the* Moſaical *Hypotheſis*? it is eaſily reſolved. For that Hypotheſis no where ties us to believe, that *all* Creatures of *every kind* exiſting *afterward*, were made within the *ſix days* of Creation. And ſo we may allow, that ſeveral Mountains, yea, all the Inland ones, came into being *after* the ſix days expired; without deſerting the Hypotheſis. Eſpecially if we conſider, that many other Mountains were made the Third Day. For ſo we are convinced, that the Earthly Creation in this regard, was no whit defective in its perfection; becauſe the Mountains then made, are ſo *very like* theſe which were afterward raiſed. But this he makes matter of a Conſ. p. 6.

Second Objection againſt our Diviſion of Mountains into *Maritime* and *Inland*. *This Diſtinction hath no foundation in Nature.* That is, there is no apparent difference in their phyſical Qualities. And pray why ſhould there be a difference in their *Nature*, when it lies only in their *Situation*? They were both ſorts made of the ſame matter, and are thought to riſe quickly one after another: but their being Ib.

pro-

produced at different times, and by different Causes, is not enough to diversifie their Substances, and to mark them with distinctive Characters. What natural Difference is there, betwixt Chickens this year hatcht by the Hen; and Chickens of the same kind the next year hatcht by the Sun? Tho he knows very well, that we never supposed any one
8. Mountain to proceed from the Suns causality alone.

Then he opposes our Distinction, from the want of *Bounds* to these Mountains. As if because it cannot justly be said, or punctually shown, where *all Maritime* Mountains end, and where *Inland* ones begin, this Distinction were groundless. And accordingly he concludes as weakly as he
rel. p. 7. argues, *that the Distinction is* meerly arbitrary and fantitous. But are there not many Mountains distant from the Sea, by hundreds of miles? and are not these plainly and properly *Inland* ones? And are there not multitudes standing upon the Sea-shore? and are not these as plainly and properly *Maritime* ones? And when GOD and Nature have *really* distinguisht Mountains by their site, into *Maritime* and *Inland*; can that distinction be *fictitious*, and meerly *fictitious*. He twits the excepter by taking his Idea of Mountains from *Hogmagog* Hills. But if this be the Philosophy that comes from the *Alpes* (whither, in his book, he gives notice he travell'd) a man had better keep at home and believe *Moses*; than cross over Seas, and clamber up Mountains, to commence Theorist.

As to his calling our *Conjecture* about the Origin of the Mountains, an *Hypothesis*; and his saying we made the *Sun* to *suck* them out of the Earth; and that on the third day, when he was made but the 4th, and the like; this is all *Crambe*. And if any can feed their Phantsies with it, when
p. p. 98, &c. we have shown the drieness and emptiness of it, much good may their insipid Diet do them.

sf. p. 8. He quarrels too with the Word, *fermentive*, as newly added in our Reply: But expressed it was most plainly in our *Discourse*, *p.* 309. And such a *Ferment* might as well be put into the Earth to make it Mountainous (Mountains being so exceed-

exceeding useful) as *Oilines* might be put into it, to make it *fertile*. See *Disc.* p. 147, 148.

And thus we come to his 3d. passage. The Answerer charg'd us with a great Mistake; that we thought *the Earth, when it changed its situation, changed its Poles and Circles*. Our *Reply*, told him, that if he had lookt into the *Errata*'s of our *Discourse*, he might have seen there, that those *Parentheses* on which he grounded his charge, should have been *left out*. And was not this a reasonable Allegation? Especially to *him*, who was fain to answer *many* of our Exceptions against his Theory (otherwise unanswerable) by pleading the things excepted against, were *left out* in a second Edition of it. Yet see the Ingenuity of this man. Notwithstanding these Parentheses were noted in the Errata's of our Discourse, to be *left out*; and that such fair notice was given him of it in our Reply; and that he had so much reason to take the notice given, upon his own account: Yet as he set down these Parentheses in his *Answer*, so here he brings them in in his *Letter*, p. 8. *Let us then lay aside the Parentheses, and the sentence stands thus*, says he. *For under the Ecliptick* (which in the primitive situation of the Earth, according to the Theory, was the Equinoctial, and divided the Globe into two Hemispheres as the Equator does now) *the dry ground*, &c. Here are the Parentheses, occurring in our *Discourse*, (p. 289, l. 15, 16, 17, 18. and noted in the Errata's, as we have said, to be left out:) Yet he cites them in his *Letter*, as he did in his *Answer*, with intention to expose the Excepter in both. But ill luck, as the fates will have it, attends this foul play; and while he resolves to be captious see how he blunders. For he undertakes to *lay aside the Parentheses*, and yet to show us how the *sentence stands*. And must not this be a fine attempt, when the very *Parentheses* to be *laid aside* make up *that Sentence* which is to *stand*; and that very *Sentence* which is to *stand*, consists of the *Parentheses* to be *laid aside*. He finds great fault with a *Rustical Wit*: may he so go thro' with what he here has in hand, as thereby to intitle h

P. 158.

to a wit refined. But how shall he do it? A Parenthesis is a Clause in the midst of another sentence, which may be left out, and yet the Sense be good. The Parentheses here are *these Clauses (which in the primitive scituation of the Earth (acording to the Theory) was the Æquinoctial; and divided the Globe into two Hemispheres, as the Equator does now)* Well then, let him *lay aside* these *Parentheses*, and when he has done show us how the *Sentence* stands; the Sentence upon which he grounds his charge, of our *thinking* that *the Earth when it changed its situation, changed its Poles and Circles.* If he *can* do this, he shall be a man of *art*, if he *cannot* do it he will be a man of *note.* And till he *does* do it (which I fear will not be in haste) we must needs take him for an incomparable Considerer. What, cast things out, and yet keep them in? Pull them down, and yet hold them up? Lay them aside, and yet leave them where they were? Custome, 'tis plain, is a second Nature: And they that are used to *Contradictions*, cannot easily forsake them. But however he here puts a Key into our hands, to unlock the meaning of some of his mysteries. For by this Rule, his Hypothesis may be *more agreeable to Scripture*, than *any other*, while it is *contrary* to it: and may be *chiefly Philosophical*, even where he *lays* Philosophy *aside.*

Review p. 12.

Eng. Theor. p. 6.

His 4th Passage is but a continuation of the foregoing Charge upon other of the Excepter's words. *viz. In her annual motion about the Sun*, the Earth *was carried directly under the Æquinoctial.* Whence he gathers, that we *would have the Earth translated out of the Equator into the Ecliptic.* But if the Ecliptick was the Æquinoctial *before* the Flood, then when she was carried under the Æquinoctial, she could not be removed out of the Ecliptic. And that the Ecliptic was the Æquinoctial *then*, according to the Theory; is evident from hence, that by the Earths moving always in the Ecliptick, a perpetual Spring and Equinox was made. And thus we took off this once before. A sign he is barren of good Objections, when such a doughty one must be twice urged.

Consid. p. 9.

But

But I can but think how Badger-like, this *Momus* would bite, could he but any where lay good hold; when upon ſo ſlight an occaſion as this, he does twice together thus ſhew his teeth.

His 5th paſſage relates to the Length of Days towards the time of the Flood. The Excepter ſuggeſted, that they might be *longer* then, than in former periods of the firſt World; by reaſon the external Cortex of the Earth would have loſt its contiguity with the Abyſs: but that they were not of unuſual length is evident, becauſe the Duration of the Flood is computed by Months of 30 days apiece. This, ſaid the Anſwerer, is *a meer Blunder. For if 30 days were to go to a month, whether the days were longer or ſhorter, there muſt be thirty of them; and Scripture does not determine the length of the days.* We reply'd, *Tho Scripture does not determine the length of days expreſsly, yet it does it implicitly, and withal very plainly and intelligibly. This is deny'd,* ſays the Conſider-er, *and if he makes this out, the Scripture does very* plainly and intelligibly *determine the length of the days at the Deluge, and makes them equal with ours at preſent; then I acknowledge, he hath remov'd the Blunder.* Why, then not to follow him in that wearisome excurſion, into which he runs about this matter; and all along as he goes, does but πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν, or kick againſt the pricks of Scripture and Philoſophy: we'll put the caſe wholly upon the propoſed Iſſue. And tho what he appeals to, be done already, and the Blunder be remov'd, and ſufficiently thrown upon himſelf for ever; yet ſomewhat more ſhall be ſaid to clear it up to him, becauſe I perceive he does not underſtand it. As ſpying but a Blunder he has a parlous Sagacity (and he has given the world good proof of as much) if he knew but when he has found it where to place it as well. But in things of Philoſophy, in caſe we may judge by ſome very plain Inſtances; his diſcerning Faculty like a feeble Eye, is even blind with light. And ſo it is here. But let us help it a little.

Diſc. p. 187

p. 38.

Rep. p. 78.

Conſid. p. 9.

According to the Hypotheſis on which both of us proceed,

the Year is measured by the Earths annual circuit about the Sun. This Circuit she performs by moving through the 12 Signs of the Zodiac, and so divides the Year into 12 Months. This Motion of the Earth (there being no *Reasons* why, or *Causes* by which it should since be slackned) must be the *same* for *swiftness* now, that it was at the Deluge. And upon these Postulata's granted which cannot by the Considerer be denied) Scripture does *very* plainly and intelligibly *determine the length of days at the Deluge, and make them* equal *with ours at present.* For that makes it plain and intelligible, that the Year at the Deluge had 12 Months, as *our* Year has; and that the Months at the Deluge, had 30 Days, as *our* Months have. And if the Months in the Year, and the Days in the Months, were the same in *Number* then, that they are now: the Days *then* could not possibly be *longer* than the days *now*, unless the *Months* and *Year* were *longer* at that time. And if *they* were longer, the *Annual Motion* of the Earth must be *slower*. And to suppose that slower, is to suppose a *Disorder* in Nature, or a *change* of her course, we know not *whence*, and we know not *why*; without reason, and upon no account, unless it be to confront Scripture. And here the Considerer fell into his Blunder, as shall be made more evident by and by.

In the next place, he would father a *false Principle in Philosophy* upon us, because we assert that the *Parts* of self-centred, quiescent earthly Bodies, are *by the* Laws of Gravity, *impregnated with a nitency inward, or downward, towards the Central point.* This Principle he denies; and affirms that Bodies *if they be quiescent, have no nitency at all, neither upwards nor downwards.* Then why do the parts of such Bodies sink and settle downward of their own accord, or by a natural force; whereas to their motion upwards, an external violent impulse is necessary? Or why do they load us with gravitation, so as to squeeze us to death, or to crush us to pieces, when they lie upon us; whereas if they lie under us, they affect us with no pressure? If nitency towards the

isc. p. 190.
p. 82.

onf. p. 12.

Center be a *fictitious quality*, as he calls it; and Terrestrial Bodies be not impregnated with it by the *Laws of Gravity*: whence arise these and the like Phænomena's? To show that, will exercise his whole Talent in Philosophy, which how great soever it seems; as he writes *more*, at this rate, must still appear to be *less*. But when I said just now, that bodies *settle downwards by a* natural force; I do not by that *force* mean any thing inherent in their Nature; but what is supervenient to them, *ab ordine à Natura constituto*; and so may not improperly be called, *Natural*. *Ib.*

What follows for six Pages together, is all Chaff; only two or three thin and dwindled Kernels may be found in it. Those therefore I shall pick out of the light heap, and show how little pith they have in them.

It is no where said in the story of the Deluge, that men and living Creatures were *drowned*; but all-a-long that they *died*, and were *destroyed*. Whence we inferred, that they might not all be directly *overwhelm'd* and *absorpt* by the Flood; but many of them by its overflowing waters might be driven to such streights, as to be *famished*, or *starved* to death. To this he opposes, that GOD says, *I will bring a Flood of waters upon the Earth to* destroy *all Flesh*. And, *neither shall all flesh be* cut off *any more by the waters of a Flood*. And that our SAVIOUR says, *the Flood came and* took them all away. *Rep. p.* 182. *Conf. p.* 13. *Gen.* 6. 17 *Gen.* 9. 11. *Mat.* 24. 49

And were not all that were *famisht* by means of the Flood, *destroyed*; were they not *cut off*, and *taken away* by it; tho they were not *drowned*? This then is but an Argument *for* us; as falling in most fairly with the reason alledged to support our Inference: and so we con him thanks for his kindness.

To his Demand, *tell us then if the waters of the Deluge were but fifteen Cubits higher than the Surface of the Sea*; we answer. As the waters of the Deluge were fifteen Cubits higher than the highest parts of the common surface of the Earth; so those on the Sea were so high, as to lie in an equal convexity with them. *Conf. p.* 14

p. 15. As to his Objection of our raiſing the Water-mark of the Flood, to an *hundred*, or *two hundred* Cubits higher than the general ordinary plain of the Earth; we anſwer. There is good reaſon for it. For between the *ordinary Plain* of the Earth, and the *higheſt parts* of that Plain; there may be ſo much difference in the pitch of Situation. This is evident from Rivers. For as the flowing of them *all* ſhows the Surface of the Earth to be *declining*; ſo the long Courſe which *ſome* of them run, ſhows it declining to ſuch a degree, as will juſtify the aforeſaid elevation of our Water-mark. Let us inſtance but in one, I mean the *Danube*. This River is ſaid to perform a Courſe of above fifteen hundred Miles. Now if we allow but half a foot declivitive to every Mile (which is little enough) the place of its fall muſt be above ſeven hundred and fifty foot lower, than the place of its riſe. Whence it follows, that the waters of the Deluge muſt be above five hundred Cubits deeper at the foot of this River, than they were at the head of it; before they could come into a true Level. But then the Courſe of the Stream being not direct, allowance muſt be made for the windings of it. And truly when *that* and all *other* things are duly allow'd for; ſtill it will remain, that our ſetting the water-mark *an hundred* or *two hundred* Cubits higher than the general ordinary Plain of the Earth; was not only reaſonable but moderate.

p. 18. At length he blames us for following Sir *W. Raleigh* as an ill Tranſlator. But had the Theoriſt been as good a Writer in his way, as that Gentleman was in *his*; when he himſelf appeared in his *Mother's* tongue, he need not fault any for coming out againſt him in the ſame. But being conſcious of ſo many and groſs errors as he is, he might well be loth to have them laid too open, and be afraid to be told of them in plain *Engliſh*.

But this is not the worſt. For we have not only *followed* a bad Tranſlation, but it ſeems we have *made* one. For he ſays we have tranſlated *rei perſonam, the repreſentation of the thing*, inſtead of *the perſon of the guilty*. And then he gives

us

us our own words which are theſe. *Tea, though it was ſpoken never ſo poſitively, it was but to ſet forth* rei perſonam; *to make the more full and lively repreſentation of the ſuppoſed thing.* And having thus drawn the Bow, he lets the terrible Arrow fly. *Here, you ſee, he hath made a double Blunder; firſt, in jumbling together* **perſon** *and* **thing**: *then if they* **could** *be jumbled together,* rei perſona *would not ſignify the* **full and lively repreſentation of the thing,** *but rather a* **diſguiſe** *or* **perſonated** *repreſentation of the thing.* And now, I'll warrant you, he he has hit the Mark, and given the Replicant a ſhrewd wound to boot. But what would you ſay, if this unlucky Arrow ſhould fall directly upon his own head? I don't ſay, and pierce his Skull; for that's too thick: I mean too thick lin'd with skill in *Latin*, as here appears. Well then obſerve but a little, and you ſhall ſee theſe two Blunders in Latin, as well as thoſe in Philoſophy (which he would run upon *us*) rolling back and reſting immoveably upon *himſelf.*

Firſt, he ſnibs us for *jumbling* together *perſon* and *thing*, as if *rei perſona* could not ſignify the *Diſguiſe of a thing*, without a *Jumble*. But hear, what a famous man ſays, to name but one. *Non hominibus tantùm, ſed & REBUS PERSONA demenda eſt, & reddenda facies ſua. The* **Diſguiſe** *muſt not only be taken off men, but* **things,** *and their own aſpect muſt be reſtored to them.* Do you ask who it is that ſpeaks? No meaner Perſon than renowned *Seneca*. He owns and declares that there is *Rerum*, as well as *Hominum perſona*. And therefore take the firſt Blunder to your ſelf; unleſs you'll make one of the ſmootheſt and ſweeteſt *Latiniſts* in the whole world, a *Jumbler* in that Language. Epiſt. 24.

Secondly, he reflects upon us, for tranſlating *rei perſonam, the* **full and lively repreſentation** *of the thing*, whereas it *ſignifies rather a* **diſguiſe**, *or* **perſonated** *repreſentation of the thing.* He ſhould therefore have conſidered, that the thing here meant, is but a *diſguiſed* or *perſonated* thing. And then that which repreſents it moſt *as ſuch*, muſt make the moſt *full* and *lively repreſentation* of it. And does not *rei perſona*

do this moſt *fully*, as it expreſſes a *diſguiſed* thing moſt *fitly*? That the thing here ſpoken of, was a *diſguiſed* thing, cannot be deni'd. For our very words cited by him, call it *the* ſuppoſed *thing*. And manifeſt it is, that we made Scripture to
Rep. p. 168, 169. ſupport our new Hypotheſis of the Flood, only in a *ſuppoſitious* or *feigned* way. And the whole thing being but *ſuppoſition*, *fiction*, or *diſguiſe*; it could not be more *fully* and *lively* repreſented, than by calling it *rei perſonam*, which emphatically ſignifies the *diſguiſe* or *fiction* of a thing. And thus, in ſhort, the Replicant did *really* do, what the Conſiderer checkt him for not *doing*: that is, he gave *rei perſonam*, its true, and proper, and adæquate ſenſe or ſignification. And ſo *both* the Blunders muſt be his own; and I cannot but ſay they are a lovely pair.

Thus we ſee how officious he is in making Rods for his own back. And how fairly he expoſes it to the laſh of the *Adage*,
Conſ. p. 18. l. 27. *Cenſor omni careat peccato.* For in that very act of reproving the Replicant for blundering, and in that very inſtance where he ſo ſcornfully does, he blunders moſt wretchedly and ſhamefully himſelf, by turning an *Elegancy* into a *Barbariſm*.

One would think here ſhould be fair warning to him for the future, not to put the Blunder ſo often upon his friend: eſpecially not to do it ſo *conſiderately*. And tho for this we do not careſs him (in the genteel ſtrein of his own uſual Courtſhip) with the complemental Out-crys, of *Ignorance*, *Injudiciouſneſs*, *Ruſtical wit*, and the like: yet we have much ado to forbear asking, who is the *Pedant* now; and grievouſly *out* in his Pedantry too?

Having thus done with the Firſt part of the Letter, we come now to the Second. And *this* exactly ſuits the Genius of *that*. For it is made up of *much* Reflection, and *little* Argument. And what ſuch a conjunction in Diſcourſe ſignifys, eſpecially when 'tis made and publiſht with *Conſideration*; the ſober and intelligent can eaſily judge. But tho the *Matter* be as bad, the *Method* however is ſomething better; for

now

now he ſpeaks diſtinctly to Chapters: and let us hear what he ſays.

CHAP. I.

IN this Chapter, he ſays, there is *nothing*, Nothing but what ſticks too faſt upon him to be rubb'd off; and ſo upon Conſideration was not fit to be meddled with. *Conſ. p.* 19.

CHAP. II.

THis Chapter, he ſays, *is againſt* Extraordinary Providence: or *that the Theoriſt ſhould not be permitted to have recourſe to it upon* any occaſion. This was no where meant, or ſaid, in our *Diſcourſe*, or *Defence*. But as we have to do with the ſame Man, ſo he will do the ſame thing: tell *Untruths* as confidently as ever. Here therefore we muſt begin a new account for him, and ſcore up *one*. And is not this worſe than *popular Eloquence*, or being *ſlippant*? An Untruth.

CHAP. III.

HEre he begins with the Moon again, whoſe ancient neighbourhood he cannot away with. But I muſt needs ſay he's ſingular in this, as having no Philoſopher like him but *Mahomet*. Nay, he much out-does *him* too, and cuts him ſheer out.

'Twas an arch Prank methinks that *he* plaid, when he fetcht down the Moon into his Sleeve. But here's one that ſhows her a more ſlim kind of trick; and yet in good truth is no Conjurer neither. Only by the power of Philoſophick Legerdemane, and deep Skill in Theory; he barricadoes her out of the World, leſt her preſence ſhould ſpoil a piece of his Architecture. But was not the Impoſtor then the civiler of the two? For when he had made the Moon to pull in her horns, and creep through his Doublet, he let her go up to her

place again. But this Gentleman, for we know not how long time mumps the World of her quite; and so, I say, perfectly outdoes *Mahomet*. For he alas, at worst, was but Nature's *Hocus-pocus*, but here's a notorious *Pick-pocket* of hers. One who by sleight of hand, and light-finger'd Philosophy, has filched no body knows what from her. That is to say, Mountains and Seas, and Silver and Gold, and all kind of Metals and Minerals at once. Now could not all this content him, but (amendment on him) must he needs at last turn *Moon-stealer* too? Fie, Doctor, fie, make restitution, and use honester Principles.

Ib. Rep. p. 17. As to what he *quæries* or *objects* touching Oily *Particles*; it is fully answered in our *Reply*. But for lack of new matter he runs upon Repetitions.

Conf. p. 19. *All the rest of this Chapter*, says he, *we are willing to leave in its full force.* And good reason why; because he cannot help it. He coucludes; apprehending *the Theory, or the Answer to be in no danger from such Argumentations or Reflections.* A new *Expedient*, and very useful; where difficult Arguments or Objections are brought, to answer them by *Apprehension*. 'Tis near akin to the *second Expedient* we noted formerly, of *passing things by with silence*. Were this as much for a Disputants *Credit*, as 'tis for his *Ease*; there would be no way like it.

Rep. p. 5.

CHAP. IV. V. VI.

ARE answered by APPREHENSION.

CHAP. VII.

CONcerning Texts of Scripture, he says, *I see no occasion of saying any more, than what is said in* the Review of the Theory. And truly he has said enough, there, to shew himself a very extraordinary Expositor. But what *occasion* soever

a man has to ſpeak, in caſe he can ſay nothing to the purpoſe, he had much better hold his Peace.

He notes that the Replicant ſaid, *the Theoriſt catches himſelf in a Trap.* And in that Trap he is like to continue. It is as improbable he ſhould ever get out, as it is impoſſible that *Iſrael*, when they marched through the *Red Sea*, ſhould paſs through a Sea *inclos'd* in the Earth. See *Rep. p.* 49.

For rendring *the Garden of the* LORD; *a pleaſant Garden*: *Gen.* 13. 10. he ſays, we brought *no authority*, &c. yet we proved it by *Divine* Authority, that is, by GOD's preferring *Paleſtine* to *Egypt*, *Deut.* 11. 10. And by that ſenſe in which the word *LORD*, or *GOD*, is often uſed in Scripture: And by the Interlineary Gloſs. See *Rep. p.* 5

His Charge of *Non-ſenſe* upon us about the word חג, he excuſes, by ſaying, he *did not* **think** *it had been ſo high.* But he knows whoſe part it is, *dicere non putaram.*

He would be told next, how *Banks*, or *Shores*, are על פני תהום, *upon the face of the Deep.* They are ſo, juſt as a tree is planted, עד פלגי־מים, *by the waters ſide.* Whence it appears that the Præpoſition על ſignifies as well, *by* as *upon.* *Pſ.* 1. 3. *Diſc.* 137, 13 And this we told him *thrice* before. 'Tis unhappy to need 334. ſuch inculcations, and uneaſie to make them.

The Theory is expreſs, that the firſt Earth was formed, *Solo Ductu*, by the **only conduct** *of the moſt known laws of Gravity and levity.* Yet here, he ſays, he *never affirm'd that theſe were the* **only** *cauſes.* What *confidence* is this, and *more?* 'Tis well he did not live before the Flood; for ſo his face would have lookt his Hypotheſis out of countenance, where it aſſerts there were no *Metals* then. See *Rep. p.* 5 *Conſ. p.* 21.

His Queſtions (tho learned) about the *Pillars of the Earth*, I think are a little beneath himſelf; conſidering what a maſter work-man he was, in rearing that Building. But ſurely, *where they ſtand*, and *what are their Pedeſtals*, &c. may be beſt reſolv'd out of his own Hypotheſis: where alone is both *place*, and *great uſe* for theſe Pillars. For how mighty conveniently might their feet be pitcht upon the *inward* *Ib.*

Earth? And then by their heads and shoulders, they would as stoutly have upheld the *outward* one. And when that decayed, and for want of repairs fell all into ruines; tho *many* of these Pillars might fall with the Fabric, yet *some* might stand. And that either *singly*, and so in *Tenariffe* would be *one*: or else in *Ranks* and *Clusters*; and so *Taurus* and the *Alps* may be Sets of these Pillars. Only great store of Rubbish (from the Roof they supported) tumbling in amongst them; of Rows of fair Columns, they might grow into Mountains. Let none therefore despise such an Hypothesis as this, which is thus improveable.

Ib. In the close of this Chapter, he says, we are for *Scripture's regulating of Hypotheses*. And so we are. But we hope it must not run us upon such Hypotheses as are inconsistent with *Science*; or that will force us to *renounce Philosophy* and *Experience*. And allowing but this Salvo; the *Motion* of the Earth, for which he frumps us, is not contrary to Scripture: nor can *Anthropomorphitisme* be allowed by it, tho never so seemingly agreeable to it.

CHAP. VIII.

FRom two Passages he would here prove, that when the Earth chang'd its *Situation* we believe that it chang'd its *Course* about the Sun. To the *first* of these passages we have *p. 60, 61.* sufficiently answered. The 2d is this. *Put case the Earth did shift her posture, and also her* CIRCUIT *about the Sun.* Now when the Earth shifted her *posture* to the Sun, must she not in *some sense* shift her *Circuit* about him? For by virtue of her Inclination, her Poles being drawn three and twenty Degrees from their Right Position; they could not run about him in the *same Circles* as it formerly did. And yet if they described *other* circles, tho the *entire* Earth did by no means change the line of its motion; it may be said, in some sense to shift *its Circuit*. So far, that is, as its *Polar* parts vary'd in their Orbit about the Sun, drawing *different* circles in their Annu-

al Courſe. This truly is the whole of what we meant. And if it will not ſatisfy him, he may go on harping ſtill, if he pleaſes, upon the ſame ſtring: but for certain it will make but ſorry Muſick, to them that have the leaſt skill in Aſtronomy.

Touching his *Equinox* he ſays, we *will not allow a witneſs to be good as to matter of fact, if he did not aſſign true cauſes of that matter.* This is juſt as much as he anſwered before, and to as little purpoſe. As he knows very well, we refuſe not his witneſſes becauſe they do not aſſign *true* Cauſes; but becauſe they aſſign ſuch as are *falſe* and alſo *impoſſible*. He that ſays, or ſwears, that he ſaw a man hang'd upon ſuch a Gibbet, may be allow'd to ſpeak truth. But if he adds, that the *halter* was made of a *Cobweb*, he ſpoils his Depoſition, and renders his evidence vain and ridiculous. Nor, I think, does *he* mightily conſult his Credit, who in any caſe that he has depending, ſub-pæna's Perſons to give in ſuch teſtimonies. *Conf. p. 22.*

He alledges farther; that *plain footſteps* of it in Antiquity, is enough to make out a *Tradition*, tho the *grounds* of it be not underſtood. If it be, it is not enough to make out *that* to be true, which the Tradition delivers; where in the very Tradition, an inconſiſtency *with*, or a repugnancy *to* the *truth* of that thing is manifeſtly included. And ſo is the caſe here, admitting the footſteps he ſpeaks of to be *plain*.

The *Conflagration* of the world as *traditionally* delivered, is no adæquate Inſtance. For that might de borrowed originally from the ſacred Scriptures where 'tis plainly taught, but in thoſe Writings we have no Doctrine of a perpetual Equinox. And therefore tho the one be infallibly true, yet the other may be utterly falſe, and ſo muſt be better proved. *Ib. p. 23.*

Then he minds us of the *fearful Blunder* we turned upon upon him, for talking as *if the Month ſhould be lengthened, by the days being ſo.* But tho we may ſee by his heaving here that he is ſenſible of the weight of an uneaſy Load; yet he will ſcarce be able to get from under it. He'll rather pull

down more difficulties on himself by fruitless strugglings, and like a Bird in a Net, by striving to get out, will be only hampered the worse for fluttering.

As for his similitude of a *too slow Clock*, it only shews his too slow apprehension in this matter. He thereby represents the annual motion of the Earth, *slower* before the Flood, and so the Year, *longer*. But in case it were so, pray what's this to the *lengthening* of *Days* then? The *making*, as well as the *measuring* of *them*, depends upon *another* motion of the Earth (from that very effect) called *diurnal*. And tho the *annual* motion of the Earth were *slacked*, and so the months were longer: yet its *diurnal* motion might continue as *swift*, and so the days be as *short* as ever. And here the comparison of his Clock, just like it self, goes too slow, and comes not up to the purpose. For there the hand goes round the Dial-plate but with *one single* motion: And so it cannot lengthen the *Hours*, but at the same time, it must lengthen the *Quarters*, and the *Minutes* too, But here it must be otherwise. For the Earth making the *Year* by *one Motion*, and the *Days* by *another*; the Year may be lengthened aud not the Days, because one motion may be slackned and not the other.

But then besides; upon what *foundation* does he build this Phantsy, of the Earth's aunual Motion being *slower* at the Deluge? What Authorities are there for it? What Reasons to prove it? What Causes to effect it? His own Hypothesis does not favour it. For that places the Axis of the Primitive Earth in a direct Parallelism to the Axis of the Eclyptic: and so made both its motions then to conspire upon the same Center. And that posture of the Earth being most *natural* to its annual motion, that motion then must needs be more *easy*, and consequently rather *swifter* than *slower*. But then what was it, I say, that controll'd Nature here, or over-rul'd her as it did? What was it that dampt the Earth in her course about the Sun, and made her more sluggish; when in regard of her then advantageous Position, she should have been nimblest in her annual Circuit? When *we* alledg'd that days might

might be *longer* towards the Flood, from the Earth's diurnal motion being *ſlower*; we aſſigned *Cauſes*, from whence an abatement in that motion might proceed. As from the loſs of the Earth's contiguity with the Abyſs below; and from the Moon's coming into its Vortex above. But here's an Effect ſuppoſed, and no cauſe aſſigned. A Violence without force. An Irregularity and no occaſion of it. In a word, he here brings a great change into Nature, juſt as he did his Chaos into the world; he knows not from whence. *See Diſc. ch.*

And thus the Conſiderer to get out of *one old* Blunder, as he thought; unluckily runs into *two new* ones. For inſtead of lengthening the Months by lengthening the days; which was his firſt overſight: he now lengthens the days by lengthening the year; and then lengthens the year by ſlackening the annual motion of the Earth: and that without Warrant from Scripture, or reaſon in Philoſophy; but againſt the tenour of his own Hypotheſis. *'Tis not uſual*, he tells us, *for a man to perſevere confidently in the ſame error.* The Error here is only in *him*, and we hope he will confidently perſevere in it no longer, ſeeing how by that means it doubles. Not to confeſs one abſurdity he ſees, is but the way to commit two. *Ib.*

But here I muſt drop a ſhort Remark. He menac'd high in his Letrer (*p.* 3.) that he would make the Excepter *evidently appear* to be a *Dabbler* in Philoſophy and Aſtronomy. But could any one think he would have executed the Threatning thus cruelly on himſelf? This it is to leave Truth's conduct, and to be led by Error. Tho ſuch a mans motion be never ſo crooked, he knows not where to ſtop his progreſs. Juſt as it fares with unhappy Travellers who have loſt their way, the farther they go the more they wander: ſo it is with Philoſophers bewildred in their Notions.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

HE says, this Chapter begins with a false Notion; that *Bodies quiescent have a nitency downwards.* And adds, *which mistake we have rectify'd if he please.* And how can we chuse but be *pleas'd* to see his Pen imploy'd so pertinently? First in *making* a Mistake, and then in *rectifying* it. Our notion, (if he will not pervert it) was truly and plainly *this* at first, as appears in our Discourse (*p.* 190.) and in our Reply *p.* 82.) *That the parts of self-centred, quiescent, earthly bodies, are by the laws of Gravity, impregnated with a nitency downwards.* And thus stated, it needs *rectifying*, as much as *Rei personam* did, and he has done it to as good purpose.

b. He says next, we falsely supposed *that the waters of the Chaos were made Oval by the weight or gravitation of the Air.* *Answ. p. 59.* But when he expressed himself by *pressure of the Air, and destruction of the Waters*, who could tell but he might impute the effect to *that* cause? But now he shows us which way he goes, we shall follow him in it.

And here he proceeds in four propositions. But they are much too weak to bear the foundations of an Oval Earth, which he would lay upon them. A few words will prove it.

The first is this. *That the tendency of the waters from the Center of their motion, would be greater and stronger in the Equinoctial parts, than in the Polar; as moving there in greater Circles.*

But whatever their *Conatus* or *tendency* towards receding from their Center might be; yet certain it is, that they *c Rep. p. 84.* could not *actually* so recede from it, as to *rise up* at the Equinoctial parts of the liquid Globe, for these two reasons. First, because things much lighter than Water, as *Chaffe*, *Feathers*, the finest *Down*, or the smallest *Dust*, will lie quiet and still, not only upon the surface of the Earth, but upon the tops of hills and mountains. And yet the Circles of motion being much larger there, than in the Globe of the Water; the motion

tion in reaſon muſt be much ſwifter. Secondly, The Waters of the Abyſs could not riſe up at the Equinoctial, as aforeſaid, becauſe the Air would keep them down. For if that had power to preſs them down there towards the Poles when they were riſen; by the ſame force it might hinder them from riſing. No more ſtrength is requir'd to do the one, than to do the other. And then Thirdly, The Waters of the Chaos could never riſe up at the Equinoctial part, and *above* flow towards the Poles, to *ſwell them out*; but at the ſame time that ſtream muſt be fed by another *beneath*, from the Poles towards the Equinoctial part; which would as much *draw them in*. And ſo this Counter-ſtream *below*, would as much *prevent* the Oval Figure, to be produced; as the other *above*, would *promote* it. And therefore the firſt Propoſition fails. See *Rep.* p. 91.

The ſecond follows in theſe words. *Agitated Air hath more force to repel what preſſes againſt it, than ſtagnant Air: and the Air was more agitated and rarify'd under the Equinoctial parts, than under the Poles.* But yet the agitated Air could not, for ſeveral Reaſons *preſs down* the Water in the Equinoctial part of the ſame. 1ſt, becauſe, as we have proved, it did not *riſe up* there. 2dly, becauſe its force upon the Water was not *ſtrong enough*. Indeed had the whole of its force been ſpent upon ſuch a body of Water, it might yet have been inſufficient for the appointed work. But inſtead of the *whole force* of the agitated Air, not a *fourth part* of it could be there beſtowed. For had the Maſs of the Air been inclos'd on every ſide, with one *ſimilar* Body, and had it exerted its force *every way* alike; it muſt have preſſed *equally* on that Body, as well *upwards*, and on *both ſides* of it; as *downwards*. But then, in this caſe, there being *ſofter*, and *more yielding* Bodies *above* the agitated Air, and on *each ſide* of it; than the Water below it: it muſt of neceſſity expand it ſelf *more* on *each ſide*, and *upwards*, than it did *downwards*. That is, more into the ſtagnant Air towards the Poles, and the finer Air above; than upon the more groſs and leſs yielding Element of Wa-

ter beneath. And ſo, I ſay, *leſs* than a fourth part of the agitated Air's force, would be felt by the ſubjacent Water. And then if we conſider farther, that Air rarify'd (as the very term implies) is made *thinner*, and ſo more apt to *aſcend*; and that the *eaſieſt* way the Air upon rarefaction had to dilate or enlarge itſelf, was by *aſcending*; in regard the *pureſt* and *lighteſt* matter lay *above* it: it will remain at laſt, that this rarefy'd Air had *little* or *no* force at laſt (much leſs a competent one) left, whereby to detrude the Chaotic Waters. 3dly, the force of the agitated Air, could not depreſs the Waters, becauſe it was not *even* enough to do it. For if the preſſure of the Air were not uniform or equal around the Equinoctial parts of the Chaotic Waters at once; how could they be evenly and uniformly ſqueezed or driven from thence, to the Polar parts, to ſhape them into an oval Figure? And yet that this preſſure of the Air could not at the *ſame time*, and in the *ſame meaſure*, be made *round about* the Waters we ſpeak of; is ſufficiently evident. For this preſſure was to be made by the Rarefaction of the Air; and the Rarefaction, by the Agitation of it; and the Agitation, by the preſence and influence of the Sun. But the Sun could ſhine but in *one* Hemiſphere at once; and as in *that*, the Agitation of the Air muſt then be different, (as it was *nearer* to him, or more *remote* from him:) ſo in the *other* Hemiſphere, the Air muſt grow very chill and cool, by reaſon of his abſence. And then according as the heat and agitation of the Air abated, ſo would the preſſure of it upon the Water be remitted. The unavoidable Conſequence whereof muſt be, that if the force of the Air could have moved the Waters under it at all; they would have moved very *intermittingly* and *irregularly*; rather after the manner of Tides, than Streams: and ſo the Oval Figure of theſe Waters, abſolutely neceſſary upon the Earth's account, would have been of impoſſible production.

The third Propoſition runs thus. *Waters hinder'd and repell'd in their primary tendency, take the eaſieſt way they can to free themſelves from that force, ſo as to perſevere in their motion.*

tion. But in the Caſe before us, theſe Waters were not ſo *hinder'd* and *repell'd* as our Author ſuppoſes; and therefore this Propoſition, which ſhould have been ſupported by the former, and made ſignificant here, ſinks together with them, and falls to the ground as uſeleſs.

The laſt follows. *To flow laterally upon a Plain, or to aſcend upon an inclin'd Plain, is eaſier than to riſe perpendicularly.* So far is this Propoſition from truth, that (as here apply'd) it wants good ſenſe. For theſe Waters flowed to the Poles, he ſays, by being *thruſt thither from the middle parts of the* **Globe.** Now if they flowed upon a *Globe*, (the Equidiſtance of whoſe Superficies from the Center, makes it equivalent to a Plain) how is it poſſible that *upon* this Plain they ſhould *aſcend?* there being no one Point in the ſurface of it, *higher* than another. Or how could this Plain poſſibly be ſo *inclin'd*, as to *facilitate* the Aſcent of theſe Waters? Here therefore the ſenſe of the Propoſition ſhews itſelf defective. For it makes Waters to aſcend, where there could be no Aſcent: and that *upon an inclin'd Plain* too, where there could be no **real** *inclination*, to help forward their motion. Yet to aſcend upon ſuch a Plain, he ſays, *is* **eaſier** *than to riſe perpendicularly*: when they could no where *aſcend* upon ſuch a Plain, to change a *Globular*, into an *Oval* Figure, but they *muſt* riſe perpendicularly. And conſequently when the Waters thruſt from the middle of the Abyſs, aſcended at its Poles; they muſt of neceſſity aſcend there, *more eaſily* than they *did* aſcend. For they could not but *riſe* there *perpendicularly*, (being to make the liquid **Globe**, *Oval*) and yet at the ſame time *aſcend upon the inclin'd Plain* of the Abyſs, which is **eaſier** *than to riſe* **perpendicularly.** And ſo here appears a farther flaw ſtill in the ſenſe of the Propoſition. But where there is *Sutor ultra crepidam; the Cobler beyond his Laſt*; he muſt needs make bungling work. Poſſibly hereafter he may *conſider* better. *Conſ. p. 24.*

Nor is this all the overſight here; for it is attended with *Two Untruths.* One he charges upon *us*. *Moreover he* *Two Untruths.* *Ib.*

says, the Waters that lay under the Poles, must have risen perpendicularly. Whereas this was never in our mind, much less did it any where drop from our Pen. The other relates to the foregoing Propositions. He says, they were *these*. Ib. But as there were *none* of them before in *form*; so the *matter* of the *Second*, was not express'd in his *Theory*, or in his *Answer*.

CHAP. X.

HEre he assaults the City *Henochia*; and that with such fury, that at the first Attaque he beats down all its Walls into *Mud* and Dirt; that so it might want neither *Iron* about it, nor *Iron-tools* to build it. And this Phantsy he would confirm by an Allegation out of *Cæsar's Commentaries:* That *a thick Wood fenced in with a Bank and a Trench*, was by the *Britains* call'd *Oppidum*, a *Town*. But first, the very reason why *Cæsar* noted this, seems to be because it was *improper* and *uncouth*. 2dly, he only noted that the *Britains* call'd it so, not that it really *was* so. 3dly, *Moses*, hope shall be allow'd to express things more *properly* than they. 4thly, *Moses* says, *Cain* built *a City* (speaking of *Henochia*;) but what Town did the *Britains* build, when they ditch'd in a Wood? 5thly, he does not only say of *Cain*, that he *built a City*; but he speaks it in the *same words* wherein he expresses the *Building* of *Babel*. Lastly, the *HOLY GHOST* makes *great difference* betwixt a *City* and a *Town*: preferring the one before the other, as much as the Mother before the Daughter. And therefore he calls Towns, בנות, *Daughters*; meaning Daughters of Cities. According to which, we read, ובבנותיה *in her Towns*, *Judg.* 11. 26. But then when the *HOLY SPIRIT* records of *Cain*, בנה עיר, *he builded a City*, *Gen.* 4. 17; how incongruous must it be to think, that he thereby means such a *British* Town as *Cæsar* describes? Had the Replicant brought down the venerable Text to so despicable an Instance; 'tis many to one but the Con-

Considerer would forthwith have fallen to *rectifying*, and immediately have pickt an *ill Translation* out of it, besides a *Blunder*.

As another Argument to prove the *use* of *Iron* before the Flood; we urged the *building* of the Ark. 'Twas answer'd, *Answ. p. 49.* * *seeing* Scripture *mentions only* Gopher wood and pitch *for building* it, *'tis a presumption rather, that there were no other Materials us'd,* We Reply'd, *if Scriptures silence concerning things be a ground of presumption that they were not, what then shall we think of an Oval and unmountainous Earth, an inclos'd Abyss, a Paradisiacal World, and the like; which the Scripture makes no mention of?* Why, says the Considerer, (*cooly and calmly*) *this is an* injudicious *reflection. When a thing is deduced by natural Arguments and Reason, the silence of Scripture is enough.* *Consid. p. 26.* Then I hope it will be granted, that there *must* be *Iron*, and *Iron Tools* used in building the Ark. For as Scripture is silent in this matter; so we have better Arguments and Reasons to prove it, than he has to prove the mention'd Particulars deduced from his Chaos. But for not alledging them, I beg the Reader's pardon. To be too serious in proving so plain a Truth, may be almost as ridiculous as to doubt of, or deny it. And as for the Doctor, he may have full satisfaction here if he pleases, by this one Expedient. Let him at leisure consult our Ship Carpenters, and offer them terms to take down Timber, and to fit it up, and to build a small Vessel of it without either *Iron*, or *Iron Tools*; and see how they will receive the Proposal. Perhaps they would conclude him to be something else more than a Philosopher; and *injudicious* might be one of their softest Reflections upon him for it. Surely since *Noah's* Ark was built, it was never taken for so *wooden* a thing as the Theory makes it. And, which is very extraordinary, *Philosophy* has form'd this Idea of it too. When once impossibles are made practicable, we may expect that strange Feats shall be done. And if Nonsense can be grafted on the Stock of Reason, the Tree must

needs bear a pretty kind of Fruit: and is it not worth the while to labour in the Experiment?

But pray what's become of *Tubal-Cain*? Is the Mechanic run quite away that we hear nothing of him now? No, no, inſtead of that, he drove ſuch a Trade as hath quite broke a Theoriſt. And I durſt undertake, that he ſhall never more hear Iron clink upon an Anvil; but he'll certainly think of this famous old Blackſmith, in whoſe ſhop ſo much miſchief was forg'd againſt him. For *Tubal* and his Workmen, by their argumentative Bout-hammers, have confuted his Theory, and beat his Hypotheſis all to pieces.

CHAP. XI.

AS to an Open Sea, *all his* Exceptions *were anſwered before*, ſays the Conſiderer, *and I am content to ſtand to that* Anſwer. Stand to it? Ay, we may take his word for it; for 'tis plain that he knows not how to ſtir a ſtep farther. If he did, he would never have taken up his ſtation here, when we told him expreſly his *Cauſe* would be *loſt* by it. But ſince *he* is reſolved to be *content* with it, *we* have ſufficient reaſon to be ſo.

Fiſhes, we affirmed, *were never upon this Earth in* Adam's *time*. And this Expreſſion, he ſays, *cannot be juſtify'd upon any Hypotheſis*. No? what thinks he of his *own*? I mean the *ordinary* Hypotheſis of his Theory, in reference to which it was ſpoken. When the Excepter, even upon the *Fiſhes account*, argu'd for early Rivers; what anſwer was given? *He muſt prove that thoſe were* River-Fiſhes; for *the Scripture makes them* Sea-fiſh. Now does not that Hypotheſis which alledges, Scripture makes *all* the Fiſh that was created, *Sea-fiſh*; and that requires proof of the *being* of *River-fiſh*; fairly deny that there *were* ſuch? Then upon this Hypotheſis our Expreſſion is juſtify'd: and what has the Conſiderer gained by his carping? But thus drowning Men will winde themſelves

every

every way; and if they catch but a Ruſh, they will hold it faſt, tho' it ſerves but to pull them more under water.

CHAP. XII.

CConcerning the *Rainbow*, as he notes, we have added *no new Argument*. And why ſhould we, when as yet he he has not anſwered the *Old* ones? particularly that of *the exiſtence of Clouds before the Flood*. *Conſ.* p. 26. *Diſc.* p. 259.

A Queſtion is mov'd, he ſays, *whether* as well, *ſignifies* as much. But *no* ſuch Queſtion is here put; and *both* the words, in the Caſe before us, ſignify *alike*. Did the Sun ſignify *as well* as the Rainbow; he would ſignify *as much*. And did he ſignify *as much*, he would ſignify *as well*. And ſo there being *no queſtion* mov'd about the words, and *no difference* at all in their ſignification here: he ſlips into *two Blunders* at once. *Conſ.* p. 26.

With the like ſucceſs he ſtarts another Queſtion. *Whether that thing could have any ſignificancy as a Sign, which ſignify'd no more than the bare promiſe would have done without a Sign.* Show us a Promiſe then *without* a Sign, which ſignifies as much as *itſelf* and a *Sign* with it: or ſhow us a thing, which being as a *Sign* joined with a Promiſe, does not *add* to ſignificancy in the Caſe. For a Promiſe is a *verbal* token or inſtrument of aſſurance touching ſomewhat to be done; and a Sign is a *real* one. And ſo *one* of theſe *bare* or *ſingle*, can no more ſignify as much as *both* in conjunction; than *one* of them alone, can be *both* of them together. Were there but *two Promiſes* of the ſame thing, (tho' they be both aſſuring Inſtruments of the ſame kind) they would be ſomewhat more ſignificant than one; as one would ſtrengthen and enforce the other. But then a Sign added to a Promiſe, muſt needs corroborate that Promiſe, and make it more ſignificative; as being an aſſuring Inſtrument of a different nature. And therefore in the very *ſtating* this Queſtion there is *another Blunder*, as I have learnt to ſpeak. And tho' I ſtill forbear to call this Gentleman *injudicious*, &c. yet he having *Conſ.* p. 27.

thus,

thus enquired touching the *Promise* and the *Sign*; I hope I may be allowed to take my turn, and to come in with *my* Quæry too, which is this. Whether it be not a very promising sign of judicious learning and acuteness, for one that is a Divine, and Lawyer, and Philosopher, and Considerer: thus publickly to ask so material a Question? As if he had demanded, whether *one* token be not as much as *two*: or whether a *Verbal* assurance *alone*, be not as good as a *Verbal* and *Real* one both.

CHAP. XIII.

Cons. p. 27. THE Theorist is made *inconsistent* with himself: he notes us, for saying, that *neither Scripture nor Reason determine the place of Paradise: and yet he determines it by the Judgment of Christian Fathers.* And is that all? So favourably do Men tell stories of themselves. But yet they should *Answer Untruth. See Rep. p. 125.* mingle no untruth with them, which is here done. For he was charged with a *Contradiction* for saying thus; *We will* never *depend* wholly *upon their Credit, nor assert* any thing *upon the* authority of the Ancients, *which is not first proved by natural Reason, or warranted by Scripture:* And then for crossing what he said, thus; (as to the place of Paradise;) *laying aside all* natural *Topics, we are willing in this particular to refer our selves* wholly *to the* report *and majority of Votes amongst the* Ancients, *whether Christians or others, who seem generally to incline to the South, or South-East land.* And when a Writer declares that he will *never* in *any thing* depend *wholly* upon the *Ancients*; and yet in *one thing* will refer himself *wholly* to them; Is he not guilty of plain Contradiction? But then he was not made inconsistent with himself, for *saying* what he *alledges* he *did* say.

Cons. p. 27. He tells us next of *undervaluing the Testimonies of the Fathers.* But he should have shewed *how* or *wherein.* I am sure it was not in calling them *strange*, and *unaccountable*, and *Ag. Theor. p. 93.* *uncouth*, and the like; as *one* does the *Expressions* of the *sacred Writers.*

The

Then he blames us for making קדם signify *the East*, without Authorities. Of all things I see we must have a care of *Translations*; for he's a deadly Observer of *Jumblings* that way. But we had the luck, I trow, to be clear of them here, as well as in his other instance; and what we meet with upon one holy Text, will witness it for us. In the 10th of *Genesis*, at the 30th verse, we read of *Sephar, a Mount of the East*. And there קדם is rendred by the *Targum*, מדנחא, *Orientis*; by the *Septuagint*, κατὰ ἀνατολὰς; by the *Vulgar*, *Orientalem*; and so I hope he is satisfy'd in this matter. *Cons. p.* 27.

The Rivers of Paradise, he says, *are differently understood*. But well may we wonder what should make *him* understand that the Fathers seated *that* and its *Rivers* in the *other Hemisphere*; when they never understood that there were *Antipodes*. To see him sweat as he does, to steer the Course of the Ancients for the *South east* Land; when 'tis known there was no such point in their Compass; must needs be comical. *Ib.*

Our restriction of *Longevity* to *some* Antediluvians, *is proved neither by Scripture, nor Reason*, he says. We prov'd it *founded upon both*; and the Arguments he hath not toucht. *Ib. p.* 28. *Rep. p.* 141, &c.

To *Moses*'s distinguishing betwixt *two races of Men before the Flood*, &c. we have answered. *Cons. p.* 28. *Ib.*

Josephus's Testimonies for the prediluvian Longevity, he owns to be *false*, but not *utterly* false. Half such a Reply to *him*, would have brought the Replicant within compass of *Pedantry*. *P.* 29.

Lastly, he wonders that we *should think it reasonable* that Mankind should increase all-a-long in a *Decuple proportion*; and that their *product, after sixteen hundred years, should be taken upon that supposition*: because *still the greater the number* of them *was, the more room there would be for accidents to out them off*. But at this he need not wonder at all, if he does but consider what himself has said. *'Tis likely they were* *Eng. Theor. p.* 2

more

more fruitful in the first Ages of the World, than after the Flood, and they lived six, seven, eight, nine hundred years apiece, getting Sons and Daughters. And if so be Mankind did live and propagate at such a rate; every pair of them might not only leave *ten pairs* more every Century, for *standing Breeders*; but also might leave *enough* besides, to fall by Accidents, or to breed as many as might do so: and so the entire *Decuple increase*, would still remain for the final Product, and at the end of sixteen hundred years, yield by far too vast a multitude, for the Earth to hold. Or if we quit this *Decuple* proportion, and keep to the *Quadruple*, which the Theory goes by; even *so* the number of Mankind, after sixteen hundred and fifty years, would be raised to *Twenty one thousand four hundred seventy four Millions, eight hundred thirty six thousand, four hundred and eighty.* Which if (with the Theory) we reckon the present number of Men upon the face of the Earth (as commonly estimated) at betwixt three and four hundred Millions; it will exceed that common account, above *one and twenty thousand Millions.* So that according to the *Quadruple* proportion (which the Theorist looks upon as *moderate*) five hundred Millions might be allowed to perish every hundred years; and yet at the Deluge there would have been above thirteen thousand Millions of people living, more than are usually computed to be so at one time: enough in all reason to *overstock* the Earth. This well considered, will make it a wonder, that the Theorist, or other ingenious persons, should believe a *general* Longevity amongst the Prediluvians, accompany'd with extraordinary Procreation of Children; I mean a fruitfulness *beyond* what *now* attends Mankind.

Ib.

ng. Theor. p. 23.

CHAP. XIV.

HEre his Civility breaks out again. But if losers, as they say, must have leave to speak; then he that loses a *World*, and of his own making, may be allow'd a liberty. But tho'

tho' he ſpeaks *freely*, does it become a man in holy Orders to ſpeak *falſely*? Yet here he does ſo. For he affirms of the Excepter, that *he ſaid*, that the *Diſſolution of the Earth was meer blaſphemy*. Whereas it was affirming *Moſes's* Deſcription of Paradice to be *falſe*; which he ſaid *would be horrid Blaſphemy*. And if the Conſiderer will apply that to himſelf, ſure it is becauſe he knows ſome cauſe for it. But when he ſays he *alledg'd* Scriptures to defend his *Expreſſion* of the *Earth's being Diſſolved*; He ſhould alſo have confuted that piece of Reply which baffles the *Allegation*. But he thought it as well to let it alone.

Conſ. p. 29. *Diſc. p. 286* *See Rep. p. 153, 154.*

In the next Paragraph he tells us of an Atchievement of his; which indeed he does well to mention and record, as being right noble and worthy of himſelf. But what is it? Why, that he had *fully cleared the innocency of Semicircles*, upon which he pretends we laid a blame. I marry, this, this is gallant and heroic indeed. When a ſage Philoſopher is arm'd cap-a pee with the bright armour of Theory and Conſideration; what can he do better than vindicate the innocent? eſpecially innocent and abuſed *Semicircles*. Is it not pity that where the intention is ſo honourable, the action ſhould be ſo inglorious? Yet ſo his unlucky Stars make it. For here he not only condemns *himſelf* greatly, but withal brings guilt upon the things he would Juſtifie. I mean, he makes theſe *Semicircles* guilty of being *Parentheſes*; which the poor innocent things, I dare ſay for them, were never thought to be before. And thus our Champion is unfortunate and quite ſucceſsleſs. That is, unleſs he can get himſelf a name (as the fam'd Knight of old did) by fighting with Windmills; and prove the renown'd Vindicator of Semicircles. And truly who can doubt but he has here done ſomething to exalt his reputation? For to make Semicircles which are *Marks* of parentheſes, to be *things* themſelves; is alike ingenious, as to make *lapides terminales*, Pool-ſtones to be Fields; or the meer bounds of a Country, to be its Continent. This is a Blunder which may go for *two*; at leaſt it is one of the firſt magnitude.

Conſ. p. 30.

He ſpeaks next to the Buildings before the Flood. And here he's ſo good humor'd, as to yield they might *then* have *Mortar and Brick.* (I believe in time he may chance to grant that they had *Iron* alſo.) But tho' this Conceſſion be ſo fair on its head, I perceive he would fain put a ſting in its tail. *If they had materials for ſtrong buildings, methinks,* ſays he, *we might have had the Ruines of an hundred Antediluvian Cities.* And ſo there might be; and upon thoſe Ruines, in proceſs of time, new Cities might be erected; only concerning the one and the other, Hiſtory is ſilent.

p. 31.

Our *laſt Argument*, he ſays, **proves** *that* GOD's *promiſe, that the World ſhould not be drowned again, was a* **vain and trifling thing** *to* **us**, *who* **know** *it ſhall be* **burnt.** And if it proves no more, it proves enough. For ſo it proves that the *Anſwerer* makes that promiſe *vain and trifling*; becauſe **he** *knows* the *Earth ſhall be* **burnt.** And then beſides; the Actions of GOD being indicative of his Purpoſes; his *declaring* the Earth ſhall be burnt at laſt, ſhews that he decreed it ſhould be ſo from the firſt. And ſo his giving *Noah* a federal Promiſe to ſecure it from being *delug'd again in the end*, muſt make that Promiſe *vain and trifling* as to GOD himſelf.

CHAP. XV.

HEre he cites *Rei perſonam*, and the *Tranſlation* of it, to his Bar a *ſecond* time, and openly pronounces this poſitive Sentence upon the Replicant in the Caſe: that *he neither makes* **good Senſe**, *nor* **good Latin.** But in the mean time does he not make himſelf a *good Judge*, as we have above ſhewed. This, methinks, is too much tho', to ſtumble twice at the ſame Stone; eſpecially when he laid it in his own way. Yet ſo it is, and muſt be with ſome. They can't be content with ſingle Miſtakes; but muſt needs repeat them. As if they meant to *ſignalize* their unlucky Errors, or affected a kind of *Eminence* in Abſurdities.

p. 34.

As to the Churche's complying with the *Ariſtotelian* Hypotheſis, ſhe always did it under the notion of its being agreeable to Nature, and congruous to Scripture; which the The-

p. 36.

ory manifeſtly is not. And when ſhe perceives that another Hypotheſis is more congruous to Nature, and as conſonant to Scripture; why may ſhe not take up with that, and reject the other in whole, or in part; or allow her Members to do the ſame?

The imperfection of Shipping *after the Flood; is a good Argument*, he ſays, *for the Theoriſt, that they had not an open Sea, Iron Tools, and Materials for ſhipping, before the Flood.* P. 37. But the imperfection in ſhipping *amidſt* ſuch Materials, for as long *a time* after the Flood, as the World *laſted* before the Flood; gives us good reaſon to conclude the contrary, eſpecially if we conſider, that amongſt the Poſtdiluvians, skill in ſhipping, or ſomething very like it, might be competently underſtood. For *Noah* (and his Sons) who builded the Ark, living hundred of years after the Flood; the Myſtery of building it could not readily be loſt. And if that remain'd amongſt the Sons of *Noah*, they muſt be fairly prepar'd for the Art of Ship-carpentry, if not in ſome meaſure, advanced in it.

Theſe are the new Occurrences in this long Chapter. What is farther objected; in the 15th Chapter of our Reply, we have fully anſwered. And to anſwer again, would be but to cloy the Reader with Rehearſals; as to repeat Objections already baffled, is to weary him with Impertinencies.

He moreover ſuggeſts of the Excepter, that he *hath a mind* Ib. p. 34. *to appear a* Virtuoſo *for the new Philoſophy, and the* Copernican *Syſtem*; that he *would be a Zealot for Orthodoxy*; and *proves neither good Churchman, nor good Philoſopher.* Alas! theſe are things ſo far below even a *Ruſtical Wit*, that they look like the laſt efforts of a ſpent Diſputant. Reaſons muſt needs be drawn low, and good Argumentation be quite out, where a Veſſel of Philoſophy is not only roiled, but runs ſuch Dregs.

CHAP. XVI.

IS anſwered by *Apprehenſion.*

CHAP. XVII.

IS answered by the same, with the addition of *extreme* Civilities. Such Civilities, as did not the World otherwise understand his Character; would assuredly discover him to be a *Clergy-man* and *Philosopher*.

But had we not best take heed of being too bold? For what e're the World thinks, it appears at last, that he's arm'd not only with *Theory*, but *Thunderbolts*. And with how terrible a Crack does one here fall? *He hath forfeited with me* p. 38. *all his Saintship, both absolute and comparative.* But thanks to Heaven, notwithstanding the fright we have scap'd the blow. These *bruta fulmina* are but Theory Meteors; which though they come with great noise, are just like its Arguments, of no force. But what, *canonize*, one year, and *cashier*, the next? This is the way to make his *Calendar* as cheap, as an *Almanack* I could mention. Did he learn this when he crept up the *Alps*, and peep'd into *Italy*? A fine World in truth, when a *Theorist* shall thus beside his *Holiness*; and stand so high upon Philosophic Pantofles as to *Saint* and *Unsaint* at his pleasure.

Tho to do him right, he is none of the worst Enemies of the Church of *Rome* neither. For could Men once be brought to believe what the Theory teaches; that the Heavens were without a Moon, when GOD assures us he made two great Lights, and one of them to rule the Night. That the Earth was increased daily, and required much more than six days for its formation; and yet was made in six minutes. That it was without a Sea, when GOD gave *Adam* and his Children Dominion over its Fish. That Paradise was seated in the Southern Hemisphere, when *Moses* describes it by Countries and Rivers here in this Northern one. That the first World had no Metals; when Scripture makes *Tubal-Cain* an Instructer of Artificers in Brass and Iron. That *Noah*'s Ark (so mighty and useful a Vessel as it was) could be built

built without Iron, or Iron-tools. Could Men, I ſay, be wrought to a belief of theſe things; how fairly diſpos'd and prepar'd muſt they be, to become hearty Proſelytes to the *Romiſh* Religion, the worſt Abſurdities of which, are as modeſt Doctrines as theſe.

At the End of our Reply, we made ſome *Exceptions* againſt the *Review of his Theory*. And how does he anſwer *them*? O moſt rarely well, and in a few words. *I BELIEVE he never expected that they ſhould be regarded.* And thus he might blow off whole Volumes of Arguments at one breath; none of them would be able to ſtand the blaſt. Make this an approvable Rule in arguing, and diſpute muſt ceaſe. For ſhould Objections be brought even as ſtrong as Mountains; ſuch a *Faith* is miraculous enough to remove them.

And thus at length we have the compleat method of defending a Theory, laid before us in the practice of it. If it contains Philoſophy that cannot be maintain'd upon *Natures* Principles, we muſt then flie to *extraordinary Providence*. If that will not juſtifie the things aſſerted, againſt Exceptions alledged, we muſt paſs them by, and ſay *the Theory is not concerned* in them. If that fails too, we muſt *explain one word by another*. If that will not do, we muſt run to *Apprehenſion*. If we want farther help, we muſt fall to *Believing*, and ſo we can never miſs of ſucceſs. For then, tho' none elſe believe as the Theoriſt does, he is ſtill well enough; for he is ſure to carry it by his Solifidianiſm. As for all Arguments, be they never ſo good, he can run them down, and confute them in a moment, by ten words ſpeaking: *I BELEIVE he never expected that they ſhould be regarded.* And truly 'tis well that we never expected that our Exceptions to the *Review* ſhould be *anſwered* neither. For if we had, 'tis plain we had been grievouſly diſappointed.

After this, he excuſes his flying to extraordinary Providence, by owning he did not debar himſelf from recourſe to it. And truly ſince he made ſo *much* uſe of it as he did; I can but wonder he ſhould uſe it no *more*. For had he but ſet

Angels

Angels to fetch Metals up through the incloſed Abyſs, to make the Earth *Oval*, and then to ſink it *down* at one of its Poles; according as he appointed them to bear the Ark *up*, &c. he had done the Theory's buſineſs more effectually.

Ib. 39. He had almoſt made the Excepter to *confound* all *extraordinary Providence*, with the *Acts of Omnipotency*. But here he bethought himſelf, and brought it in with an IF.

Ib. *The Theoriſt*, he ſays, *did not admit of the* Creation *and* Annihilation *of Waters at the Deluge*, and his Reaſons for it *are no where confuted*. And the Reaſon is, becauſe they were ſo trifling and very ſhallow, that they did not deſerve it. But ſince he demands Confutation, we ſhall not deny it, even where 'tis needleſs.

The Firſt of theſe Reaſons is an Authority or Quotation *ng. Theor. p.* 19. of St. *Auſtin's*. In a certain Caſe it adviſeth us rather to have regard to the *Scriptures*, than to what GOD would do *by a miracle of his Omnipotency*. But how does this hinder his *creating* Waters, and annihilating them at the Flood, when *Scripture* ſpeaks not one word againſt it?

The ſecond Reaſon is, *Moſes's aſſigning the Cauſes of the Deluge*. But could there not be 40 days Rain upon *new Waters being created*, as well, better than if only the old ones had been continued? And as the Flood roſe *leiſurely* by the deſcent of new Waters in Rain; ſo could it not vaniſh *gradually* again, as thoſe Waters by degrees were turned firſt into vapours, and then into nothing?

Ib. The third Reaſon is, St. *Peter's aſſigning the Cauſes of the Deluge*. But could not the World that then was, periſh as well by being overflow'd by *new created* Waters, as by others?

The fourth is, *We are not raſhly to have recourſe to the Divine Omnipotency*. And where lies the *raſhneſs* of this recourſe, when the opinion is neither againſt Scripture, nor yet againſt Reaſon, and has been the ſtanding Hypotheſis in the Church of GOD?

Vſ. p. 39. He alledges next, that the *Letter* of *Moſes's Coſmopœia* is *improperly*

improperly urged againſt him and without ground. For his ſenſe of it, as he has *often intimated*, is, that it is expreſt *more humano, & ad captum populi.* And therefore *objections from the letter of it, affect not the Theoriſt*, as he tells us. For he hath *no where aſſerted that it is to be literally underſtood.* But then if Moſes's *Coſmopæia*, or *ſix days Creation*, be not to be *literally* underſtood; we have the ſame complaint againſt *him*, which he now made of *us*, that our Reaſons or Arguments for underſtanding *Moſes* in *that ſenſe*, are *no where* anſwered or confuted. And withal here it plainly appears, that the Theoriſt in explaining the Natural World, proceeds in the Method of *Ordinary Providence*; however he has left *others* to take the way of *Extraordinary Providence* if they pleaſe For where *Objections* are made *from the letter of the* Moſaical *Coſmopæia* (which he ſays, *does not proceed according to* Ordinary Providence) he declares that they do *not* reach or *affect the Theoriſt.* Tho it is very pretty that he ſhould tell the Excepter, *'tis much he ſhould never obſerve ſuch obvious paſſages*, as ſhow *how the Theoriſt underſtood that* Coſmopæia, when the Second Chapter of his Exceptions is almoſt *wholly* ſpent, in proving that it is to be *literally* underſtood, and *not* as the Theory underſtands it. In time he may learn to be more advertent. To be ſhort; in caſe *Moſes's* Coſmopæia be not to be *literally* underſtood (where the literal ſenſe can take place) let him ſpeak it out and prove it; that ſo they who believe it to be an hiſtory of the Creation, may be undeceived. And by his Arguments may be throughly convinc'd, that it is but a Syſtem of Philoſophic Notions, or the like, ſymbolically delivered.

Diſc. Chap. 2.

Conſ. p. 39. Ib. p. 40.

Ib.

He cloſes this Paragraph with declaring, *that he hath no ambition, either to make the* Excepter, *or any other of the ſame diſpoſitions of will, and the ſame elevation of underſtanding, proſelytes to his Theory.* And now I think he has met with us all. For take it from me, we are never like to be ſo happy now, as to believe the Theory to be a *true piece of Natural Hiſtory, and the greateſt and moſt remarkable that hath yet been*

ſince

since the beginning of the World. That an Earth could be made in *six minutes*, which was *DAILY increased.* That *Adam* and his Children could have *dominion* over the *Sea*, when there was none. That *Noah's* Ark could be built without *Iron*, and *Iron-tools.* That *Tubal-Cain* could be a Blacksmith, and a Brasier, when there was *no Metals.* Believe it these are entertaining things. But how much more diverting must the Earth's *spontaneous production of Animals* be; as affording such variety of pretty Scænes, and matter for continual sports and recreations? Thus to see Nature *Pigging* in one place, and *Calving* in another. Here to see her spawn Frogs and Toads; and there, Lions and Elephants. Now to see her spring Covies of Partridges, and anon to cast off her Hawks at them. Must not this be extremely gratifying? I say nothing of a stout *Puss's* being now and then put up from lying in her native Form; and of a *Greyhounds* being let off Natures Slip to scudd away after her. Nor do I mind you of the cackling congratulations to be heard amongst Hens, upon their first entrance into being; nor of the sweet gagling consort that Geese us'd to make, especially if a Reynold chanc'd to be gendered near them. Alas, from all such delights as these we are now eternally shut out, by being denied Proselytism to the Philosophic Theory. Cruel man! could no revenge serve the turn less than such an exclusion? But still let's take heart; for so long as *solamen miseris, &c.* holds good, we have some comfort left us. For the learned Gentlemen of the University of *Leipsick* are fallen under the same Doom. Tho I wonder they should have no more *elevation of understanding*, than to *censure* the Theory so *publickly* as they have done.

Then he comes to the *Literal sense* of Scripture. And here
p. 41. he would fain clear himself of the charge of *contradicting Scripture in natural things.* But he does it so awkardly and untowardly, that he plainly betrays the guilt he would hide, and rather aggravates it, than acquits himself of it. By endeavouring to wipe the Smut off, he only rubs it all about his

his face. For he pleads, *'tis the* literal Senſe *of Scripture only that is here ſpoken of, which the Excepter alſo is ſaid to contradict.* Now when one ſhall excuſe his contradicting Scripture in natural things, by ſaying he contradicted only the *Letter* of it; when as to theſe natural things, it has *no other* than a *literal* meaning: is not this a goodly Apology? The Scripture, for inſtance, ſays, that *Adam* and his poſterity ſhould have *Dominion* over the Sea; and the Theoriſt ſays, there was no Sea. The Scripture ſays, that *Tubal Cain* was an inſtructer of artificers in *Braſs* and *Iron*; and the Theoriſt ſays, that in the World before the Flood there was no *Metals*. Now when in reference to theſe *Natural things*, Scripture can be underſtood no otherwiſe than *literally*; for the Theoriſt to excuſe his contradicting Scripture here, by pleading he contradicted it *only* as to the *letter in theſe natural things*; is to allow that in *natural things*, Scripture *may* be contradicted: the very crime wherewith he was charged.

But could *he* prove that the *Excepter* contradicts Scripture thus; the firſt thing he would do, ſhould be to ask GOD's pardon, and all good mens for it. But inſtead of proving this, he would make the Excepter to contradict the *Letter* of Scripture, forſooth, by aſſerting that the *Earth moves*, and *not* the *Sun*; becauſe the *Pſalmiſt* tells us of the Sun's coming out of his Chamber as a Bridegroom, &c. Now either he did alledge this Argument in good earneſt, or he did not. If he *did*, it is an Argument againſt *himſelf*, who proceeds upon the Hypotheſis of a *moving Earth*. If he *did not*, he trifles moſt egregiouſly, as he does in abundance that he writes. A pregnant inſtance of as much follows. The Replicant ſhewed what ridiculons abſurdities would attend a *literal acception* of the *Pſalmiſts* words, about the Motion of the Sun; in going contrary to the Letter of which, the Anſwerer would make him to go contrary to Scripture. Now, ſays the Conſiderer, *if a man ſhould ridicule, at this rate, the Diſcourſe of our SAVIOUR concerning* Lazarus *and* Dives, *he would have a thankleſs Office.* Yet let the Conſiderer, or any one elſe,

Rep. p. 107

Anſw. p. 8

Conſ. p. 41

take that Diſcourſe in a *ſtrict literal ſenſe*; and *not* ridicule it at ſuch a rate. And yet as a *literal* acception would perfectly ridicule our SAVIOUR's Parable; ſo it would do the *Pſalmiſt*'s ſimile no leſs. A moſt clear evidence that neither of them are *literally* to be underſtood. And then how could the Replicant go *contrary* to *Scripture* (as the Anſwerer would make him) in going contrary to the *letter* of the *Pſalmiſt*'s Expreſſion?

In his two next Paragraphs (as well as in other paſſages of this) the Conſiderer trifles; and if he pleaſes, he may go on to do ſo ſtill.

And thus we draw towards a Concluſion. Which ſhall conſiſt of a ſhort Scheme of ſome *Inconſiſtencies*, or *Contradictions* wherewith our Author is hampered; of ſome *Untruths* or *Miſtakes* wherein he is loſt; and of ſome *Abſurdities* manifeſting the weakneſs of his *Judgment*.

I begin with his *Contradictions*; And theſe are of two ſorts. Either Contradictions to *Scripture*, or Contradictions to *Himſelf*.

His Contradictions to Scripture.

1 His Theory proceeds in way of *Ordinary Providence*. Witneſs the *Separation* of the Chaos, the *Deſtruction* of the Chaotic Waters, the *Formation* of the Earth, &c. But he ſays, that *Moſes*'s Coſmopæia *does not proceed according to ordinary Providence*, *Conſ. p.* 39. So that in his Procedure he is *generally*, and little leſs than *profeſſedly* contradictious to *Moſes*.

2. Scripture (as he notes in his appeal to it) *tells us that the Earth was formed the* 3*d. day*, *Anſw. p.* 5. But he teaches that it was *increaſed* daily, *Eng. Theor. p.* 59.

3 Scripture makes it evident that *Moſes*, in his *Coſmopæia*, treats of *Light*, and of the *Stars*, *Gen.* 1. 3. 16. And of the *Soul of man*, and of the *Hoſt of Heaven*, *Gen.* 2. 7. 1. But he affirms that *the ſubject of the* Moſaic Geneſis, *is the* Chaos, *and that confus'd and earthly*; *and the things made out of this*

Diſc. p. 99, &c.

Chaos

Chaos, *and related to it as a Center*, *Lat. Theor. Edit.* 2. *p.* 234.

4. Scripture informs us that GOD gave *Adam* and his Children *Dominion over the Fiſh of the Sea*, *Gen.* 1.28. But he puts it amongſt the *Vitals* of his Hypotheſis, that the primitive Earth was *without a Sea*, *Eng. Theor. p.* 288.

5. Scripture deſcribes Paradiſe, as ſituate in this *Northern* Hemiſphære, *Gen.* 2. 8. But he places it in the *Southern* one. *Eng. Theor. p.* 262.

6. Scripture ſays that *Tubal-Cain* was an *Inſtructer of Artificers in Braſs and Iron*, *Gen.* 4. 22. But he believes they had no *Metals in the firſt Earth*: But that *they lay then aſleep in the dark and deep womb of Nature*, *and ſaw not the Sun till many years and ages afterwards*, *Eng. Theor. p.* 244.

7. Scripture calls the *Firmament* betwixt the Waters, *Heaven*, *Gen.* 1. 8. But he makes it the *exterior frame*, or *orb* of the firſt habitable *Earth*. *Lat. Theor. p.* 124, 254.

8. Scripture declares that GOD on the fourth day *made two great Lights*, *and the Stars alſo*, *Gen.* 1. 16. But he ſays, that nothing elſe is thereby to be underſtood, but the *appearing* of thoſe Lights upon the diſſipating of the Chaos, and the clearing up of the air. *Lat. Theor. Edit.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 7. Yea, *this* he can *demonſtrate* he there declares; and the next news we hear is, that he left the paſſage out of a 2d. Edition. As to Paſſages *out*, we have no reaſon to take notice of their being ſo; inaſmuch as he will not allow *one* paſſage of ours (the *Parentheſis* aboveſaid) to be left out by us; tho it was markt in the *Errata's* our *Diſcourſe* to be left out, before ever the Book was publiſhed.

9. Scripture is expreſs that *all the fountains of the great Deep were broken up*, *and the* **Windows** *of heaven opened on the* **ſame day**, *Gen.* 7. 11. But he *does not ſuppoſe the Abyſs to be broken open till* **after the forty days rain**, *Eng. Theor. p.* 98. And again he ſays, *Anſw. p.* 31. *he does not ſuppoſe the cataracts of heaven to have been opened* **before**, *which made the grand rains*. Yet theſe *Cataracts* were thoſe *Windows*

10. He ſays the Scripture, *aſſirms* **expreſly** (concerning the waters of the Deluge) that they *covered the* **tops** *of the*

highest hills, Answ. p. 82. And again, *Scripture* **says** *they covered the* **tops** *of the highest Mountains. ib.* But Scripture does no where in the story of the Flood, make the least mention of the *tops* of hills or mountains.

11. The Scripture describing the day of Judgment, tells us, *that the* **Sea** *gave up the dead which were in it, Apoc.* 20. 13. But he makes it the *distinguishing Character* of the *new Earth*, at the *end* of which he brings in the Day of Judgment, to be this; that it shall be **without** *a Sea, Review p.* 11. And by understanding St. *John's* words **literally**, *there was no more Sea, Apoc.* 21. 1. makes him plainly to contradict himself.

12. The Scripture teaches, that *the Heavens and the Earth which* **are now**, *are kept in store, reserved* **unto fire against the day of Judgment**. 2. S. *Pet.* 3. 7. What Doctrine is, or can be more plain and positive? But yet he will have the *present* Earth *reduc'd (by the Conflagration, as it is explain'd in the third Book) to a second Chaos; a Chaos truly so called. And from that, as from the first*, says he, *arises another Creation*, or **new Heavens** and a **new Earth** (at the *end* of which he Places the Day of Judgment) *Review, p.* 6. And so notwithstanding the Scripture's express assertion of the thing; *the Heavens and the Earth which* **are now**, cannot be **kept in store**, and **reserved unto fire** till *then.*

13. The Scripture says of GOD, *he hangeth the Earth* **upon nothing**, *Job.* 26. 27. And that *he* **founded** *it* **upon the Seas**, *Psal.* 24. 2. And our Author by understanding the Texts *literally*, and applying them to his first habitable Earth; forceth Scripture to contradict it self. See *Discourse p.* 142.

His

His Contradictions to himself.

1. He proceeds in his Theory by way of *ordinary Providence*, according to which *the formation of the Earth would require much more time than six days. Answ. p.* 2. Yet to answer an Objection, he crosses his Hypothesis, and brings in *Extraordinary Providence*, whereby it might be *made in six minutes*, *Ib.*

2. He supposes the Earth made by *Extraordinary Providence*, *Answ. p.* 2. Yet he says it was made *solo ductu*, by the **sole guidance** *of the known Laws of gravity and Levity*, *Lat. Theor. Edit.* 2. *Cap* 6.

3. He says that the Earth was made by the *SOLE CONDUCT of the known Laws of gravity and levity. Ubi supra* Yet he says again, he *never affirm'd that* **these** *were the* **only** *causes*, *Cons. p.* 21.

4. He affirms (speaking of its *formation*, that *the first habitable Earth hung over the waters*, **sustain'd by nothing** *but it's own peculiar form*, *and the libration of its parts*, *Eng. Theor. p.* 88. Yet he says, that *it had the Mass of the waters as a* **basis** *or* **foundation** *to* **rest upon.** *ib. p.* 61. And was *built upon it and* **sustained** *by it. Review p.* 21.

5. He will have these words, *He gathereth the* waters of the Sea as in a Bag, *Psal.* 33. 7. *to show the disposition of the waters, in the first Earth,* **inclos'd within the vault of the Earth,** *as in a Bag*, *Eng. Theor. p.* 86. Yet he tells us *the place speaks of the* **ordinary posture** *and constitution of the waters,* **in a level or spherical convexity** *with the rest of the Earth*, *Answ. p.* 21.

6. He declares, *we will* **never** *depend* **wholly** *upon their Credit, nor assert* **any thing** *upon the authority of the* **Ancients,** *which is not first prov'd by* **natural Reason,** *or warranted by Scripture. Eng. Theor.* p. 4. Yet concerning the *Seat* of Paradise, he thus expresses himself. *Laying aside* **all natural** *Topicks, we are willing in this particular to refer our selves* **wholly**

to

to the report and Majority of Votes amongſt the Ancients. *ib. p.* 262.

7. He aſſerts, that Noah *and his Family were ſaved by water, ſo as the water which deſtroyed the reſt of the world, was an inſtrument of their conſervation, inaſmuch as* it bore up *the Ark*, &c. *Eng. Theor. p.* 98. Yet he aſſerts again, *GOD certainly did give his* Angels *charge over* the Ark; *that* they ſhould bear it up in their hands. *Anſw. p.* 62. And there was *no neceſſity* of its being *afloat*. *Ib.*

8. He gives notice that the Theory is chiefly *Philoſophical*, *Eng. Theor. p.* 6. Yet many Phænomenaes of his Hypotheſis, and ſeveral of them *chief* ones, are derived from, and dependent upon Extraordinary Providence, and the Miniſtry of Angels. Thus, for inſtance.

He makes the *formation* and *conſtruction* of the Earth, the work of *Extraordinary Providence*, *Anſw. p.* 3.

He aſcribes the *Peopling of the world*, to *Miracle*, and will have Angels to *carry* men *thorough the torrid Zone*. *Anſw. p.* 30.

He ſuppoſes the *general Flood* to be *miraculous*; for he ſays *thoſe Rains that made it were* extraordinary, *and* out of the courſe of nature. *Ib.*

He tell us of *Rivers*, that by a natural *proceſs*, *they could not flow throughout the Earth, all on a ſudden: but you may* accelerate *that proceſs* as much as you pleaſe, *by a* divine hand. *Anſw. p.* 15.

He imputes the *ſaving of the Ark* (upon which depended both the preſervation, and ſecond propagation of mankind) to the Angels *holding it afloat in the Air*. *Anſw. p.* 62. And ſo to name no other inſtances, inſtead of an Hypotheſis *chiefly Philoſophical*; we have an Hypotheſis, in *chief* Phænomenaes of it, plainly *miraculous*, *divine*, and *angelical*. But whatever glory this may bring to the Theory; it can do its Author but little honour, thus to involve himſelf in Contradictions. In this unhappineſs he is ſo ſingular, that he is under a neceſſity of ſending forth his Papers, in another Edition, to ſet things right; unleſs it be his pleaſure to continue peerleſs.

His Untruths or Miſtakes.

1. He ſays, That *Egypt* is compared in Scripture, or joined in priviledge with Paradiſe itſelf. *Anſw. p.* 23. whereas it is not ſo, but only *part* of it. See *Reply, p.* 51.

2. He affirms, That the Excepter ſays, the word חוג, ſignifies no more than the *rotundity*, or *ſpherical figure* of the Abyſs. *Anſw. p.* 25. whereas the Excepter ſaid, that by it might be meant, either *Earthly Bounds* about the open Waters; or the *Firmament of Heaven*, as a Sphere, Orb, or Arch, ſet upon the face of the Deep. See *Rep. p.* 58.

3. He complains, That the Excepter hath done the *Theory* an *Injuſtice* by a *falſe Accuſation*, in ſaying it makes the conſtruction of the firſt Earth *meerly mechanical*. *Anſw. p.* 26. when yet he owns the Earth was formed, *Solo ductu*, by the ſole conduct *of the moſt known Laws of gravity and levity*. See *Rep. p.* 59.

4. He makes the Excepter to *tranſlate* the Earth, at the change of its ſituation, from the *Equator* into the *Ecliptic*; becauſe he ſays that before that change, ſhe was *carried directly* (in her annual motion about the Sun) under the Equinoctial. *Anſw. p.* 27. whereas the *Ecliptic* being the *Equinoctial* in *his* firſt World; and the Excepter ſaying that the Earth was *carried* Directly *under the Equinoctial*; he could not poſſibly ſuppoſe that ſhe was ever in the *Equator*, nor conſequently that ſhe was *tranſlated* from *it*. See *Rep. p.* 60, 61.

5. He tells the Excepter, That he hath two or three Reaſons after the *laſt*. *Anſw. p.* 30. whereas the word, *laſtly*, which he ſtumbles at, did not refer to the *laſt* of the *Reaſons*, but to the *laſt* of the *Inſtances* belonging to one of the *Reaſons*. See *Rep. p.* 65.

6. He affirms, That the Philoſophy of *Orpheus*, the *Phœnician*, *Egyptian*, and *Perſian* Philoſophers, did all compare the Earth

Earth to an Egg, with respect to its oval external Form' *Answ. p.* 40. But that is a very false Assertion. See *Rep. p.* 92' 93.

7. He says, the Excepter supposes that the Sun, by his heat, raised the Mountains upon the Earth, the third day. *Answ. p.* 45. whereas he never supposed, that the *Sun alone* raised any Mountains; much less that he raised them the third day. See *Rep. p.* 98, 99, 100, 101, 102.

8. He affirms of the Excepter, that he says, GOD might *as well* as to significancy have appointed the *Sun* as the *Rainbow*, for a sign that there should never have been another another Flood: and that the *Sun* would have done *as well* as the *Rainbow*. *Answ. p.* 53, 54. But this is utterly false, as any one may see, *Rep. p.* 121.

9. He says, the Excepter fairly baulks *all* the Difficulties in the Doctrine of Paradise. *Answ. p.* 55. But this also is falsly charged upon him. See *Rep. p.* 129.

10. He says, he prevented the Objection of *Noah's* Ark being destroy'd by its Fall; by putting it under the conduct of its Guardian Angels. *Answ. p.* 61. whereas it is evident, that he did not put the Ark under their conduct *at its fall*, but *in the extremity of the flood*. See *Rep. p.* 157.

11. He says, the Excepter affirms, that the flood was but fifteen Cubits high above the *ordinary level* of the Earth. *Answ. p.* 66. whereas he affirms it to be so high above the *highest parts* of the Earth's common Surface. See *Rep. p.* 165.

12. He says, the Excepter gives the *Sun* a *miraculous* power to draw up waters. *Answ. p.* 73. But we no where ascribe such a power to him, and therefore he here incurs the Censure of a false Accuser. See *Rep. p.* 178, 179.

13. He says, the Excepter, by all means, will have holes in the Rocks, to be the *same* with the *Mosaical Abyss*. *Answ. p.* 79. whereas 'tis manifest, that he makes the Caverns in Rocks and Mountains opened at the Deluge, to be but *Fountains* of *Moses's* great deep. See *Rep. p.* 192, 193.

14. He

14. He ſays, according to the Excepter, the *Great Deep* was not *one* continued cavity, but *ten thouſand* holes ſeparate and diſtant from one another. *Anſw. p.* 75. Whereas *our Great Deeps* being but *Fountains* of *Moſes*'s; His was ſtill but *one*, tho ours were *never ſo many*. See *Rep. p.* 193.

15. He ſays, according to the Excepter, the *great deep* muſt not ſignify a *low place*, but an *high place*; for the Caverns were higher than the common level of the Earth. *Anſw. p.* 75. But this is a Third Miſtake built upon the ſame ground of inadvertency with the two former. For had he but conſidered, that *our* Great Deeps are but *Fountains* of *Moſes*'s Great Deep; the latter he would have apprehended might have been *low* enough, tho the former were as *high* as we placed them. See *Rep. p.* 104.

His Abſurdities.

1. He aſſerts, that if the Ancient Earth and Abyſs were in no other form, nor other ſtate than what they are under now, the *expreſſions* of the ſacred Writers concerning them are *very ſtrange* and *inaccountable*, without any ſufficient *ground*, or any *juſt occaſion* for ſuch *uncouth repreſentations*, *Eng. Theor. p.* 93.

2. That he has *proved* his Explication of the Deluge to be a *true piece* of *natural Hiſtory*; and it may be the *greateſt* and *moſt remarkable*, that hath yet *been* ſince the *beginning* of the *World*. *ib. p.* 96.

3. That the Earth under its preſent form could not be Paradiſiacal, nor *any part* of it. *ib. p.* 184.

4. He makes it a *Vital* of his Theory, that neither *Noah*'s Flood, nor the preſent Form of the Earth, *can* be explained in any other *method* that is rational, nor by any other Cauſes *that are* intelligible. *ib. p.* 288. How many and how great Abſurdities are contained in theſe four Aſſertions, and may fairly be gathered out of them, is not eaſy to ſay. They are too numerous for me to reckon up, and ſet down here.

5. He argues for the formation of the Earth upon his Chaos, from the formation of Ice upon the Surface of the Sea *Answ. p.* 6. The absurdity of which see, *Rep. p.* 14.

6. He tells us there would be more need of Moon-shine, in a World where are long winter nights, than in a perpetual Equinox. *Answ. p.* 7. The absurdity of which see. *Rep. p.* 15.

7. He supposes that an Ocean of water and oil could strain through the Circumference of the Chaos; and yet leave Earthy Particles enough behind floating in the Air, to compose so great an Earth as ours. See *Rep. p.* 21.

8. He contends, that a *just proportion* of *Des-Cartes* his Elements, was as necessary to make the World; and a just proportion of our Rock-water and Rain-water, to make the Flood: as a just proportion of his Ingredients could be necessary to make his Earth. *Answ. p.* 8, 9. The absurdity of which see, *Rep. p.* 22, 23. *&c.*

9. He pleads in behalf of a certain reflection of his, that it was *modest*. *Answ. p.* 21. And yet it backs such an explication of Scripture, as makes the *Israelites* pass through a Sea then *inclosed* in the Earth. See *Rep. p.* 49.

10. He maintains a *perpetual Spring* to all the world, and a *continual Verdure* of the Earth. *Eng. Theo. p.* 196. And yet grants that the Curse of GOD (which made the Earth *barren*) might *have its effect*. *Answ. p.* 29.

11. He brings in *Ovid* to witness the Truth of his Theory Doctrine. *Answ. p.* 35. When there is *nothing* more *contrary* to it than that Poets testimony. See *Rep. p.* 75.

12. He would establish his opinion also by attestations of Philosophers. *Lat. Theo. li.* 2. *cap.* 10. When the evidences

they give in are charged *with*, and ſo voided *by* notorious *impoſſibilities*. See *Diſc. ch.* 8. *Sect.* 7. and *Rep. p.* 68, 69, *&c.*

13. *Anaxagoras* (agreeably to his wild Hypotheſis of generating ſtars out of ſtones) aſſerted that an huge ſtone fell down from the Sun. This our Author interprets of the *incruſtation* of a fixt ſtar, and its *deſcent* into the lower world. *Anſw. p.* 34. The abſurdity of which, ſee in its incongruity to thoſe relations of the thing, which occur in *Laertius*, *Plutarch*, and *Pliny*; and are noted, *Diſch. ch* 8. *Sect.* 7. and *Rep.* p. 68, 69, *&c.* Where it will appear, amongſt other Overſights, that while he makes uſe of a Philoſophers teſtimony, he præpoſterouſly deſtroys its credibility: and impugns the fidelity of thoſe Writers, by whoſe pens the teſtimonial paſſage was recorded; and out of whoſe Books, not only that Teſtimony of *Anaxagoras*, but the reſt he alledges, were by him quoted.

14. He cites the authorities of Chriſtian Fathers, in favour of his phantſies, out of *Bellarmine*. *Anſw. p.* 36. When the Cardinal ſignifies that what they ſaid, was ſpoken *hyperbolically*, See *Rep. p.* 76.

15. Tho *Moſes* deſcribes Paradiſe by the *very* Rivers *Tigris*, *Euphrates*, *&c.* He will have them to be rivers like *to theſe*. *Anſw. p.* 60. And yet he declares, that if we admit his Hypotheſis concerning the fraction and diſruption of the Earth at the Deluge, then we cannot expect to *find Rivers now*, as they were *before*; the *general ſource* is changed, and their *Channels* are *all broke up*. *Eng. Theo. p.* 252. See *Rep.* alſo *p.* 152.

16. He ſays, the place of Paradiſe cannot be determined by the Theory. Yet if we would undertake to confute the Theory, he ſays, we ſhould have confuted this particular. *Anſw. p.* 55. And ſo he fairly puts us upon proving that the Theory *can* do, what he profeſſes openly it *cannot* do. See

17. He talks of Vapors *little purer* than water, *Answ. p.* 37. When the *grosseſt* Vapors cannot bear up a piece of *Cork*; but upon Water, *Ships* of the greateſt burthen ſwim.

18. He makes the Chaotic waters *oval*, *defluendo ad latera*, by their flowing *down* to the ſides or poles of that Maſs, *Lat. Theor. p.* 198. *Ed.* 1. When to make it into that figure, it was abſolutely neceſſary that they ſhould there *riſe up*. See *Diſc. p.* 193, 194.

19. He argues that the Mountains of the Moon may be much higher than thoſe of the Earth, tho produced the ſame way. *Anſw.* p. 44. Notwithſtanding the Globe of the Earth is above forty times bigger than the Orb of the Moon. See *Rep. p.* 97.

20. According to *his* Hypotheſis, there could be no Metals in the prædiluvian world, unleſs they aſcended through a watry Abyſs. See *Diſc. p.* 217. Yet that Metals were then extant, is evident, *Gen.* 4. 22.

21. He ſays, the Doves *returning*, might be her returning into her *principles*, that is into an *Egg*; not into the *Ark. Anſw. p.* 77. When Scripture ſays expreſsly, that ſhe *returned unto him* (*Noah*) *into the Ark*. *Gen.* 8. 9.

22. As to *Coldneſs*, he would have Fiſh live as well in the *Abyſs*, as in the *frozen Seas*. And as to *Cloſeneſs*, and *Darkneſs*, he would have them ſhift there, as well as a *Child* in its *Mothers Belly*. *Anſw. p.* 51. The abſurdity of which, ſee, *Rep. p.* 109, 110, 111.

23. He makes the forty days Rain (to which GOD chiefly aſcribes the Deluge) *quite ſuperfluous*. For he ſays, *I do not ſuppoſe the Abyſs broken open till after the forty days Rain*, *Eng. Theo.* p. 28. And *after* that was broke up, the waters

of

of it were ſo raging, that there *wanted* no rain to make the Flood. And *before* it was open'd he now ſays, there needed no Rain to preſerve the Ark. *Anſw. p.* 62. And ſo the Rain that fell in thoſe forty days, he makes wholly uſeleſs.

Theſe are a few of thoſe many *Abſurdities* the *Theoriſt* is guilty of. And I might eaſily add as many more to them, were I not afraid of wearying the Reader, as I have done my ſelf. But having noted enough, to ſhow how Writers that diſregard *Moſes*; by *Contradictions*, *Miſtakes*, and ſtore of *Abſurdities* diſparage themſelves (which was my deſign:) and having hinted ſome things as fit to be *left out* of his *Anſwer* and *Conſideration*, as thoſe which he once left out of his *Theory*; I think I may now reckon that my work is done as to this Subject.

From his way of writing in thoſe *Pamphlets* (to uſe his *own* term) I could ſufficiently expoſe the *Temper* of the Doctor, as well as his *matter*; and prove him *diſingenuous* as well as *erroneous*. But I am willing to diſtinguiſh betwixt the *Pen* and *Perſon* of any Writer; and to think that the one may deſerve pity, when the other provokes a different Paſſion. I ſhall only mind him therefore of a modeſt Character which he beſtowed on a late Animadverter of his; namely, that *he writ neither like a Gentleman, nor like a Chriſtian, nor like a Scholar*; and ſo leave him to conſider how much of it is *juſtly* applicable to *himſelf*.

See his *Cen.* *p.* 1. *l.* 6.

Anſw. p. ult.

FINIS.

Books lately Printed, and to be Sold by *J. Southby*, at the *Harrow* in *Cornhill*, 1691.

TWO Treatiſes. The Firſt, concerning Reproaching and Cenſure: The Second, an Anſwer to Mr. *Serjeants* Sure-footing. To which are annexed Three Sermons Preached upon ſeveral Occaſions, and very uſeful for theſe Times. By *William Falkner*, D. D. in 4to.

A Letter to Father *Petre*, concerning his Part in the Late Kings Government. Wherein all his Actions are Juſtified; and wherein alſo the Forgery of a Prince of *Wales* is freely Confeſſed and Juſtified, in 4to.

The Benefit of Early Piety, Recommenned to all Young Perſons, and particularly to thoſe of the City of *London*, By *William Smythies* of *Cripplegate*. in 12s.

A ſhort View of the Duty of Receiving the Sacrament. Fit to be Read in the time of Preparation. With Additions of ſeveral Prayers neceſſary to be uſed, before and after *Communion*. in 24s. Second Edition.

A Sermon Preached before the Queen, by *Jonathan Blagrave*, Sub-Almoner, and Chaplain in Ordinary to their Majeſties.

FINIS.